Howes (T.)
2.A.A.e.

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON BOOKS, ANTIENT and MODERN.

NUMBER I.

[To be continued occaſionally.]

CONTAINING

I. An Examination of Mr. Wood's Eſſay concerning the Genius of Homer.

II. Remarks concerning Dr. Henry's Hiſtory of Britain, Whitaker's Hiſtory of Mancheſter, Bertram's Edition of Ricardus of Cirenceſter, and Horſeley's Antiquities, tending to illuſtrate the State of Scotland under the Romans.

LONDON:
Printed by W. RICHARDSON;
And Sold by B. WHITE, in Fleet-Street.
M DCC LXXVI.

7

CMC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

AN

EXAMINATION

OF

Mr. WOOD's ESSAY

CONCERNING

THE GENIUS OF HOMER.

In Preface, p. 11.

"A Preference (of the Iliad to the Odyſ-
" ſey) can be traced no higher than Longinus."—" Ariſtotle, Horace, Quintilian, the great profeſſed critics of antiquity, make no ſuch diſtinction." *In note.*

This does not ſeem to be true: for though none of theſe antients had occaſion expreſsly to inform their readers to which poem they themſelves gave the preference, yet their commendations ſeem to contain ſufficient indica-

tions, that the voice of antiquity, before the time of Longinus, gave the preference to the Iliad. Quintilian ſays, Homerum nemo in magnis ſublimitate, in parvis proprietate ſuperaverit. The former of theſe two commendations, and the moſt important, muſt as neceſſarily be referred to the Iliad, as the latter to the Odyſſey, even in the opinion of Mr. Wood himſelf; for he ſays, "As the Odyſſey is more deſcriptive of private and domeſtic life, ſo its paintings are often of that finiſhed kind, which produces reſemblance and character out of *very trivial* incidents." *p.* 9. When Horace has occaſion to mention both poems, he ſpeaks of the Iliad before the Odyſſey; which ſame conduct we may alſo obſerve in Ariſtotle's Poetics, and in Dionyſius's Life of Homer, and in Heraclides Ponticus, I think without exception in any of them. This can ſcarcely be the mere effect of chance, but muſt be reaſonably attributed to the priority of eſteem, which the Iliad had obtained in the judgment of the antients; a preference, therefore, of which Longinus was not the author, but only an humble follower. Ariſtotle ſays, ωσπερ Ιλιας και Οδυσσεια. Poet. Sect. 4. Dionyſius ſays, Εισι δε Ομηρω ποιησεις δυο; Ιλιας και Οδυσσεια, and frequently again in the ſame order. Heraclides repeatedly does the ſame, particularly in the following paſſage, wherein he alſo expreſſes the

the characters of each poem in the ſame manner as Longinus afterwards. Απο της εναγωνιε και πολεμικης Ιλιαδος επι την ηθικην μεταβωμεν Οδυσσειαν, ουδε γαρ αυτη τελειως αφιλοσοφητος.—*A contenſioſa et bellicoſa Iliade tranſeamus ad mores deſcribentem Odyſſeam; neque enim hæc omnino philoſophiæ expers eſt.* This as clearly marks, that the Odyſſey was not conſidered equal to the Iliad, as if I were to commend the buildings in London from Burlington-houſe to the Manſion-houſe. Ariſtotle is ſtill more particular: his words are, Δευτερα δε, ἡ πρωτη λεγομενη ὑπο τινων εστι συστασις, ἡ διπλην τε την συστασιν εχουσα, καθαπερ ἡ Οδυσσεια, και τελευτωντος εξ εναντιας τοις βελτιοσι και χειροσι. Sect. 13. *That conſtitution of an epic tale, which is reckoned the firſt by ſome, is in reality but the ſecond in point of excellence, namely, that which, like the Odyſſey, has a double ſet of characters, one virtuous and one vitious, and wherein the action alſo ends contrarywiſe to the virtuous and vitious agents, ſo that the former terminate in proſperity, and the latter in adverſity.* I have tranſlated this paſſage differently from the interpreters, but in a ſenſe, which may be proved the real one of Ariſtotle: however, in either this or any other interpretation, that chief article (according to Ariſtotle) of an epic poem, the fable of the Iliad is herein preferred to that of the Odyſſey; for that the fable of the Iliad is the reverſe of

what is here aſcribed to the Odyſſey, is ſufficiently evident. It is wonderful then, how Mr. Pope could ſay, " That Ariſtotle makes no ſuch diſtinction (*as Longinus*) between the two poems; but conſtantly cites them with equal praiſe;" *Poſtſcript to the Odyſſey:* or that Mr. Wood could ſo implicitly copy this remark from Pope concerning Ariſtotle's ſentiments, which his own words prove to be directly contrary to what Pope affirms, namely, " that the conduct, turn, and diſpoſition of the fable (of the Odyſſey) is what the critics allow to be the *better* model for epic writers to follow." *Ibid.*

P. 13. " Homer has tranſmitted to us a faithful tranſcript of human nature, impartially exhibited under the circumſtances, which belonged to his period of ſociety, as far as his experience and obſervation went."

This ſeems to me a miſtake both in Mr. Wood and other critics before him; for I think there are ſufficient indications in Homer, that he himſelf lived in a more civilized ſtate of human nature, than that which he has deſcribed in his poems; but that he thought it proper to attribute to his heroes of antient times long before his own, a more rough as well as ſimple ſtate of manners, than he was himſelf witneſs to in his own times; juſt as Virgil after him,

and

and as all other epic poets and tragedians have done ſince.—This will be farther conſidered afterwards.

P. 4. " The Iliad contains a *conſiſtent* narrative of military events, connected and ſupported by that due coincidence of the circumſtances of time and place, which hiſtory requires."

True; and this is one reaſon, why Ariſtotle prefers not only the Iliad, but other epic and *fancied* tales to *real* hiſtories, becauſe the former may be made to have that conſiſtency in character, manners and actions, which the latter want; for the actions of men in *real* hiſtory will be too often found inconſiſtent with their characters and ſtations. To conclude therefore as we ſhall find Mr. Wood does afterwards (*p.* 182), that this narrative of Homer contained the *real* truth and *hiſtory* of military actions performed at Troy, becauſe it contained a *conſiſtent* and *probable* narrative of exploits, is not only directly contrary to all reaſonable concluſion, but to the expreſs teſtimony of antient authors, who have always conſidered Homer as a liar in a civil way, by making both perſons and things better than he found them; therefore different from hiſtoric and traditionary truth, as it prevailed in his own or ſucceeding times. Mr. Wood himſelf acknowledges (*p.* 301), that he repreſented men *better* than he found them.

P. 9. "If Ithaca was the ſcene of this conference, the ſituation of Syros is very inaccurately laid down; for in reality this iſland ſo far from being placed *beyond* or *farther from* Ithaca than Ortygia is, ſhould have been deſcribed as nearer to it."

Not in the leaſt inaccurately laid down, but only Mr. Wood has given a wrong ſenſe to Homer's word, καθυπερθεν. Eumæus ſays, Νησος τις Συριη κικλησκεται Ορτυγιης καθυπερθεν ὁθι τροπαι ηελιοιο. Lib. xv. 402. The Latin tranſlation has rightly retained *ſupra* here; Pope alſo renders καθυπερθεν by *above*, and there is nothing in his notes to contradict it. Bochart firſt erroneouſly tranſlated that word by *trans delum* (Canaan. Lib. i. 14.) *beyond Delos or Ortygia:* he fell into another miſtake in placing Syros to the eaſt of Delos inſtead of the weſt. Dacier has copied both his errors, and blames Euſtathius and Boileau for being right in placing Syros weſtward of Delos; ſhe therefore in like manner tranſlates it *au dela*, i. e. *beyond*, and underſtands *beyond* to mean eaſtward of Delos, conſequently *beyond* it with reſpect of Ithaca. The geographers indeed, Cluver particularly, and I believe Cellarius too, place Syros eaſtward of Delos; but Mr. Chandler has cleared up this doubt, and fixed it to the weſt of Delos in his map of the Ægean ſea: whether he copied it from d'Anville I know not. Mr. Wood has, however,

however, certainly followed the errors of Dacier.

But the whole of this altercation among commentators about eaſt and weſt, is in reality foreign to the determination of Homer's meaning; the only queſtion is, whether Syros lies *above* or *below* Delos with reſpect to its ſituation in the Ægean ſea, and not with reſpect to Ithaca (which does not lie in the Ægean ſea) nor yet with reſpect to Smyrna on the continent, as Mr. Wood ſuppoſes. In all rivers *above* means nearer to the ſource, and *below* nearer to the mouth: in like manner in gulfs or bays of the ſea, *above* means nearer to the head or top of the bay, which is always the moſt inland part of it, and where the rivers run in; and *below* means nearer to the bottom or mouth, where it begins to open into and communicate with the wide ſea. Thus alſo in the Ægean ſea the head or top muſt be at the Helleſpont, where that channel empties itſelf into this ſea, and the bottom muſt be where the Ægean ſea communicates with the reſt of the Mediterranean ſea towards the coaſt of Libya: the iſlands neareſt to the top muſt therefore be *above*, and the iſlands neareſt to the bottom muſt be *below*, with reſpect to their ſituation in the Ægean ſea. The real queſtion therefore is, whether Syros be ſituated nearer to the Helleſpont than Delos, and thus *above* it, or nearer to the coaſt

of

of Lybia and therefore *below* it: it is true, that the maps ſeem to place Syros *below* Delos in this ſenſe; but Mr. Chandler's map removes this objection alſo to Homer, by placing Syros a little nearer than Delos to the head of the Ægean ſea, and therefore *above* it juſt as Homer deſcribes: it would be unreaſonable to ſuſpect, that he did this on purpoſe to exculpate Homer, if he had not really found that to be its true ſituation; for I know of no commentator who has ever conſidered the queſtion in the ſenſe and manner above pointed out; which may, however, be farther confirmed from Homer himſelf; who ſeems never elſewhere to have uſed καθυπερθεν and υπενερθεν with reſpect to the Ægean ſea in any other ſenſe than this. Mr. Wood himſelf refers to a paſſage in Homer (*p.* 40), wherein both theſe words are uſed in the ſenſe which I have pointed out, and which one ſhould have thought might have led him to the true ſenſe of Homer concerning the iſland of Syros; Homer's lines are,

Η καθυπερθε Χιοιο νεοιμεθα παιπαλοεσσης,
Νησου επι Ψυριης, αυλην επ' αριστερ' εχοντες,
Η υπενερθε Χιοιο, παρ' ηνεμοεντα Μιμαντα.
Odyſſ. l. iii. 170.

Neſtor is here relating to Telemachus, that at the return of the Greeks from Troy, a diſpute aroſe, "whether they ſhould ſail to Greece

above

above Chios, and near the iſland of Pſyria on the coaſt of Chios; thus leaving one or both upon the left hand; or whether they ſhould keep along the coaſt of Aſia, until they got *below* Chios, and then croſs the Ægean ſea to Greece." The iſland Pſyria here mentioned is not the ſame as Syros, which is the Syria mentioned by Eumæus near Delos; nor yet the ſame as Scyros upon the coaſt of Eubæa; but a ſmall iſland at the north end of Chios, as both Dacier and Pope underſtand it, and as it is marked in Chandler's map †: now in this paſſage the words *above* and *below* can have no other reference than *nearer to* or *farther from* the head of the Ægean ſea: in which ſenſe Mr. Wood himſelf explains it, but ſeems ſtudiouſly to avoid the words *above* and *below* employed by Homer. Dacier however retains theſe Greek prepoſitions, and tranſlates them by au deſſus, *above*, and au deſſous *below*: ſo does the Latin tranſlator; and whatever other difference there may be among other commentators, concerning which of the two was to be eſteemed the *longeſt* or the *ſafeſt* way, yet they all agree in conceiving *above* to mean neareſt to the Helleſpont, and *below* fartheſt from it. It is the

† Strabo mentions it alſo. Contra Melænæ Promontorium eſt Pſyra inſula excelſa diſtans ſtadiis 60. lib. 14.

more wonderful alſo that Mr. Wood ſhould not have conceived the right ſenſe of καθυπερθεν, in regard to Delos; when he acknowledges that a friend ſuggeſted to him, whether it might not be uſed in its aſtronomical ſenſe, as meaning neareſt to the North Pole; in the caſe of the Ægean ſea theſe two ſenſes unite, becauſe this ſea happens to run north and ſouth, but in other caſes υπενερθεν might have juſt as well expreſſed the eaſt, ſouth or weſt, in caſe the head of the bay or gulf had been to the weſt, north, or eaſt of the bottom of it.

If it be true alſo (as Euſtathius aſſerts) that τροπαι and τρεπεσθαι are uſed to denote the ſetting of the ſun, I can not but think the ſenſe of Euſtathius perfectly right with reſpect to τροπαι ηελιοιο, and preferable to Mr. Wood's new invented one; that is, Homer meant, "that the iſland of Syrus was ſituated not only *above* Delos, but alſo to the *weſtward* of it;" this is exactly the ſituation, which Mr. Chandler gives it in his map, who appears to have had no idea of explaining this paſſage of Homer, wherein its ſituation in the Ægean ſea is ſo accurately deſcribed; at leaſt not of explaining it in the ſenſe and manner above mentioned, which although the moſt obvious and ſimple, no commentator ſeems to have had any conception of. It is certain alſo, that the excellent antient lexicon of Heſychius agrees with Euſtathius; for

it

it explains τροπαι to mean αἱ δυσεις as well as αἱ μεταβολαι.

P. 51. in note, "I am of opinion, that the Plain of Sodom and Gomorrah was the original ſcene of the fable of Typhon."

This is a mere conjectural fancy, deſtitute of any good ſupport from ancient authors, whoſe words Mr. Wood has therefore miſrepreſented in order to ſupport his own opinion; as we ſhall ſee. He ſays, *that the* Αριμοι *are confeſſedly the ſame as the Syrians, as we learn from the Septuagint, Strabo, Joſephus, Euſtathius, and Bochart.* The Septuagint and Joſephus are no ſufficient authorities; what Euſtathius ſays I know not; but he was too late a writer to be a judge: and Strabo certainly does not deliver any ſuch thing as his own opinion; but only gives it as the opinion of ſome perſons among ſix other opinions —Quidam Syros pro Arimis accipiunt, quos nunc aramos vocant. So far is he here from approving this opinion, that he plainly teſtifies in the above words, that thoſe who embrace it are only guided by ſome ſimilitude they find in the two names without any other reſembling circumſtances *. He ſeems rather to concur

* And in his ſixteenth book he ſtill farther ſhews, that the part of Syria referred to here was not in the neighbourhood of Sodom, but of Antioch and Seleucia upon the river Orontes. Orontes prope Antiochiam procedens in mare Seleuciæ proximum defertur: hoc in loco de Typhone et arimis, de quibus a nobis antea dictum eſt.

in the opinion of Scepſius—Scepſius *veriſimilius* eos dicere arbitratur qui Arimos in *Exuſta* Myſiæ ponunt. lib. 13. Neither does Bochart approve this ſenſe of Mr. Wood or even attempt to determine where *Arimi* was; but only obſerves that it was a miſtake in Pliny to ſuppoſe, that the Inarime of Virgil was the ſame with the ἐν Αριμοις of Homer in his lib. ii. (Canaan. lib. i. 33) we ſee how ready theſe ingenious men are to torture the words of other ingenious men into ſome authority for their own fancies. The *exuſta* of Myſia, as the antients called it, was certainly the place where Homer, or thoſe writers neareſt to Homer's time placed the ſcene concerning Typhæus. Mr. Chandler's deſcription of that diſtrict anſwers ſtill to the ideas of it among the antients, it having viſible remains of vulcanos, the earth covered with nitre and ſulphur, no freſh water ſprings, but all ſulphurous and brackiſh: Its ſituation alſo anſwers to that deſcribed in Homer; for Strabo places the *Exuſta* near the head of the Hermus—Hermus per Exuſtam in Sardianum campum defertur. lib. 13. It has mount Tmolus therefore on the ſouth, and near mount Tmolus Homer places Typhæus's birth place. Mr. Wood himſelf quotes the line of Homer, which proves it, as it is preſerved by Strabo, but ejected from our preſent copies, by Ariſtarchus perhaps: for after Strabo

has quoted the line of Homer Εν Αριμοις, ὅθι φασι Τυφωεος εμμεναι ευναι (lib. ii. 290.) Strabo adds, Some annex alſo the following line,

Χωρῳ εν δρυοεντι Υδης εν πιονι δημῳ.
Sylvoſo in agro, Hydis in prepinqui gente.

If Ariſtarchus has rightly ejected this line as not being Homer's, yet it certainly muſt have been of high antiquity; and it places the ſcene of Typhæus in the diſtrict of Hyda. But where was this place Hyda? Mr. Wood adopts a conjecture of Dr. Taylor, that it ought to be read Ιουδης *Judæa*, and by this critical ledger-demain he transfers the ſcene to Judæa *. Strabo indeed confeſſes that "nulla Hyda apud Lydos inveniatur;" yet he adds, nonnulli Sardes Hydam vocant. However this may be, another line of Homer mentioned alſo by Strabo, ſhews at leaſt whereabout Hyda was ſituated, namely near the foot of mount Tmolus; for after quoting the 371ſt, 372d, and 373d lines of the ſecond book of the Iliad, he ſubjoins, addunt etiam hunc quartum verſum—

Τμωλῳ ὑπο νιφοεντι Υδης εν πιονι δημῳ.
Pinquis ubi Hyda jacet Tmolo ſuppoſita nivali.
Il. xx. 385.

Here it is expreſly ſaid, that Hyda was near mount Tmolus, and therefore near the *Exuſta*

* This conjecture was copied by Taylor from Dickerſon's *Delphi Phœnicizantes*.

of

of Myſia before mentioned, if not the very ſame; alſo near the Gygæan lake—επι λιμνη γυγαιη. 390. There ſeems alſo ſome probability, that this Hyda is the ſame with the diſtrict called *Hydriade* by Herodotus; who ſays, Amnis Marſyas ex Hydriade regione defluit in Mæandrum. Lib. 5. Now it appears by Mr. Chandler's map, that the Marſyas runs into the Meander at its head directly from north to ſouth; it riſes therefore out of the ſame diſtrict with the river Hermus, and has mount Tmolus on the weſt. This Hydria muſt conſequently have had nearly the ſame ſituation with the Hyda above mentioned. There is no end of ſuch mere conjectures as theſe of Mr. Wood and Dr. Taylor: they might as well preſume that Pantaleon the brother of Cræſus was born of a Jewiſh mother, becauſe Herodotus ſays he was born *ex Jade* matre (εξ Ιαδος) probably the adjective of *Hyda*, as Cræſus *ex carica matre* means of Caria; ſome MSS. of Homer have Ιδης inſtead of Υδης.

P. 62. " We find only thoſe winds, which blow from the four cardinal points expreſſly mentioned in the Iliad and Odyſſey."—" So imperfect a liſt of winds correſponds with the coaſting navigation of thoſe times."

Inſtead of conſidering this as any teſtimony, that the liſt of winds was then more imperfect than

than afterwards, I conſider it as a proof of Homer's judgment; for he did not write for this or that city and province only, but for all the Grecian ſtates: now the four cardinal winds were univerſally the ſame and known to all Greece; but the ſubdiviſions of them were not; almoſt every iſland, city and province gave different names to the ſubdiviſions of the winds, and thoſe often local names, according to the name of the mountain and province, from which any wind blowed on themſelves. The names of theſe muſt have cauſed an endleſs confuſion, and according to my conception aforementioned needleſs anachroniſms alſo; for Homer would have hereby made the Trojan heroes talk of winds not ſo named until perhaps ſome hundred years afterwards: he therefore gives them a more ſimple liſt of winds, for the very ſame reaſon, that he gave them more rough and ſimple manners, than prevailed in his own time, that is, from a motive of propriety.

P. 64. "Eurus is employed in melting the ſnow, which Zephyrus brings down; and Notus covers the mountain tops with clouds, which it is the buſineſs of Boreas to diſpel. Zephyrus is called hard-blowing, rapid, the ſwifteſt of all winds, noiſy, whiſtling or rattling, moiſt, and is repreſented as bringing rain or ſnow."

The

The qualities, which Homer in Ionia aſcribes to Eurus and Zephyrus are the very ſame which Ariſtotle attributes to them on the weſtern ſide of the Ægean ſea. Thus in regard to the warmth of Eurus and the cold of Zephyrus, ſays he, Θερμοτερα τα απο της Εω των απο δυσμης. (Meteorolog. Lib. ii. 7.) But Mr. Wood has not done Homer all the juſtice concerning this ſubject, which his general plan required, and which Ariſtotle could have aſſiſted him in. For if Homer aſcribes many different and even oppoſite qualities to Zephyrus it ſeemed incumbent on Mr. Wood, to have confirmed from Ariſtotle or by other means that Zephyrus really poſſeſſed all theſe qualities. Mr. Wood does not point out the particular paſſages in Homer; but I have endeavoured to collect them all: And that they are all juſtifiable, as being truely copied from nature, will appear from one or other of theſe three heads of juſtification, Firſt, many different weſterly winds were included under the common name of Zephyrus even ſo late as in the time of Ariſtotle, as well as more antiently under Homer. Secondly, They had different qualities at different times of the year; and Thirdly, They produced different effects under different circumſtances. In regard to the firſt head Ariſtotle ſays, that Zephyrus is properly that wind, which blows from the equinoctial point of the weſt,

weſt, that is, directly weſt (δυσμη ισημερινη). But he adds, " *that both the Ithagines* (ſouth-weſt and by ſouth) *and the Argeſtes* (north-weſt and by weſt) *are alſo included under Zephyrus:* it is indeed true that ſome of theſe blow really from near the north and others from near the ſouth; yet he adds the *Zephyrica are commonly all annexed to the northerly winds* (προστιθεται δε τα ζεφυρικα τω βορεᾳ.) and for this reaſon, becauſe *they are colder on account of their blowing from the Weſtward.*" He ſhews, that even winds ſtill nearer to the north are alſo included under Zephyrus, ſuch as the Aparctias (which is the north-weſt and by north) Ὁ ſαρ Απαρκτιας ζεφυρος εστιν. We may hence eaſily conceive, that if all the winds from very near the ſouth pole round by the weſt almoſt to the north pole were included under the generic name of Zephyrus even in the time of Ariſtotle, when they had particular names alſo for each wind, Homer can be never juſtly blamed for aſcribing to Zephyrus ſo many different qualities. Accordingly we ſhall in fact find, that ſecondly and thirdly, in different times of the year, and under different circumſtances the qualities of it were very different, For ſays he " *Zephyrus properly ſo called* (i. e. full weſt) *blows chiefly about the ſummer tropic* (περι τροπας θερινας ζεφυρος.) This therefore muſt be the gentle cooling ſummer wind, which Mr.

Wood and the orientals now call the *Inbat*, and the antients the Eteſian winds, which, as Ariſtotle ſays, veers round from the northward to the weſt in ſummer *: this is alſo Homer's *gently whiſtling* Zephyrus (λιγυς). Again Ariſtotle ſhews, that when on the contrary the Zephyrus blows more from the ſouthward, it becomes like the Eurus ſultry, καυματωδης δε νοτος, και ζεφυρος και ευρος. Sometimes alſo in that caſe it is *moiſt and cloudy*, νεφεσι δε πυκνουσι τον ουρανον. On the contrary the Zephyri which blow from between the weſt and north are *high* rattling winds, which produce a *clear* ſky; Απαρκτιαι και Θρασκιαι και Αργεσται πολλοι τε και ισχυροι μαλιστα: The Thraſciai winds he ſhews to be the north-weſt, the two others are the middle points between the Thraſciai and the north on the one ſide and weſt point on the other; therefore the Thraſciai muſt blow from Thrace, and thence probably had their name. He adds, that theſe three winds produce however a *clear ſky*, *diſpelling the hovering clouds* (αιθριωταται εισι των ανεμων, αποφυσωντες τα συνιστα μενα νεφη) except when they happen to be rather *cold* than *high*; for then they produce a contrary effect, and do not cauſe a *clear* ſky, but by congealing the clouds rather than diſ-

* Οι Ετησιαι περιστανται εκ των Απαρκτιων εις Θρασκιας, Αργεστας και ζεφυρους.

pelling

pelling them prevent it; αν γαρ μαλλον ψυχροι η μεγαλοι φθανουσι, πηγνουνλες μαλλον η προωθουνλες. And laſtly, when they are *exceeding cold*, they produce *ſnow and hail*. νιφετωδης δε απαρκτιας, ουλοι γαρ ψυχροτατοι, χαλαζωδης δε ο απαρκλιας και θρασκιας και αργεσλης. Thus then it appears, that the Zephyrus has actually all the different qualities, which Homer aſcribes to it in different compariſons and caſes, according as it blows from different quarters, or at different times of the year, or under different circumſtances.

We can now therefore giṽe a better anſwer to the objection of Eratoſthenes mentioned by Mr. Wood at *p.* 22, than either Strabo or Mr. Wood has done *. Homer was plainly in no error, as Eratoſthenes pretended, when he made the Zephyrus blow from Thrace, for we have ſeen that Ariſtotle does the very ſame; but Homer ſeems to have mentioned this circumſtance of its blowing from Thrace, on purpoſe to point out to his reader what ſpecies of Zephyrus he had in view, namely a high, hard blowing one, which conſequently roſe very *ſuddenly*: for we ſhall find, that the ſuddenneſs of this wind is another property, which

* Ως δ' ανεμοι δυο πονλον ορινετον ιχθυοεντα,
Βορεης και Ζεφυρος, τω τε Θρηκηθεν αηλον,
Ελθονλ' εξαπινης.
Iliad. l. 9. 5. Wood's Eſſay, p. 23.

uſually attends it, and which Homer alſo indicates by the words ελθονθ' εξαπινης. Ariſtotle agreably to this ſays, Επιπιπτουσι δε τοις αλλοις μαλισθα και παυονται Απαρκτιαι και Θρασκιαι και Αργεσται δια το εγγυθεν την ὁρμην αυτων ειναι, *The Aparctiai and Thraſciai and Argeſtai ruſh ſuddenly upon other winds more than any and make them to ceaſe, on account of their blowing from parts near at hand.*" Now what do the laſt words mean, except that theſe winds pour down ſuddenly from the mountains of Thrace. We may conclude then, that when to the names Βορεης και Ζεφυρος Homer adds this circumſtance τω τε Θρηκηθεν αητον, ελθοντ' εξαπινης, he intended to particularize what ſpecies of Zephyrus he meant, namely that which burſts ſuddenly from Thrace; for in this ſuddenneſs of the ſtorm the chief force of the ſimile conſiſts by comparing to the effects of it the trembling agitations of the Greek at the late ſucceſs of the Trojans, which had burſt like a ſudden ſtorm upon them. Mr. Wood ſays, there is only one other place in Homer, where the Zephyrus is mentioned as coming from Thrace; I wiſh I knew where to find it. But on the other hand, in Lib. xxi. 334, we find the Zephyrus there mentioned particularized by a different addition, namely that of αργεσταο Νοτοιο *;

* Αυταρ εγω Ζεφυροιο και Αργεστιαο Νοτοιο
Εισομαι εξ αλοθεν χαλεπην ορσουσα θυελλαν.

this

this is the Argeſtes of Ariſtotle, not only in point of direction and quality but even of name. This blows from the point of the weſtern ſummer Solſtice, therefore with reſpect to the Ægean ſea and Greece it really blows from the ſouthward. It is a violent wind we have ſeen, but drives away rain and makes a clear ſky; it was therefore well ſuited in point of direction as well as quality to the purpoſe of Homer here, to drive the fire of the Greeks eaſtwardly, i. e. towards Troy, and alſo to prevent rain from extinguiſhing it; for Ariſtotle ſays ξηροι δε Αργεσ̃ης και Ευρος. *The Argeſtes and Eurus are dry.*" If in other caſes Homer has preferred to diſtinguiſh the Zephyri by epithets or circumſtances rather than by theſe their proper names of Thraſciai and Argeſtes and ſuch others, he certainly choſe the more poetical part; and it can not be thence concluded, that thoſe proper names were not known in his time; of which his mention of Argeſtes is a ſufficient indication: which name ſeems to have been added here on purpoſe to diſtinguiſh this drying wind (vulgarly conſidered as a ſoutherly one, but really blowing from the weſtern ſummer Solſtice) from another and a really ſoutherly one called Libs, blowing from the weſtern winter Solſtice; and which has the oppoſite quality of ſometimes, and only ſometimes bringing up black ſtorms of rain, as we ſhall ſee in the

next example, which rain would have been ill ſuited to Homer's purpoſe. But before I quit this preſent one, it may be proper to mention, that Mr. Pope has without good cauſe forſaken the original here; although indeed he has only taken a like liberty as Dacier and all other interpreters, who by merely conjectural additions to theſe deſcriptions of winds have too often deſtroyed the propriety of Homer. Such inſtances would have been a more juſt ſubject of cenſure againſt Pope, than thoſe which Mr. Wood produces. Pope has here—" Ruſh the ſwift eaſtern and the weſtern wind." The eaſtern is quite oppoſite to the right direction, as it would blow the flames to the Grecian camp; and the peculiar qualities of the weſtern are loſt; he ſhould have ſaid —" Ruſh on a ſudden a dry weſtern wind." Dacier is nearer to the ſenſe—" The impetuous ſouthern wind and violent Zephyrus." But ſtill ſhe loſes the two real qualities of this wind, dryneſs and ſuddenneſs in the common quality of impetuoſity and violence, which is leſs characteriſtic of the Argeſtes. I ſhewed before that Ariſtotle ranks the Argeſtes among the ſudden winds, the dry ones and the Zephyri: and by its blowing from the 23° of north latitude, it would appear ſcutherly to Attica and Ionia in the 39°.

In the fourth book Homer paints the character of another and a really ſoutherly wind,

wind ‡, the Libs, which blows from the weſtern winter Solſtice *; and only ſometimes, as Ariſtotle ſays, brings up black ſtorms of rain. νεφεσι δε πυκνουσι τον ουρανον, καικιας μεν σφοδρα, λιψ δε αραιοτερως,—περι δε την μεταπωριην οι λιβες. do. 6. *The Cæcias makes the heavens very often black with clouds, but the Libs more ſeldom*; or σφοδρα and αραιως may ſignify the different degrees of blackneſs: in either ſenſe we ſee, that it muſt be the Libs, which Homer means here by Zephyrus: this being alſo included vulgarly under Zephyrus; and this being the only ſpecies of Zephyrus mentioned by Homer, which does bring up a ſtorm of black clouds. The Cæcias is from the oppoſite point, the eaſtern ſummer Solſtice. In the foregoing example Homer employs the word θυελλα, in the latter λαιλαψ; now if the author of the book *de Mundo* (whether Ariſtotle or not) has rightly explained theſe words, they ſuit exactly to the two different ſpecies of ſtorm above mentioned; he ſays θυελλα means *a ſtrong wind which ſuddenly ruſhes forth* †. But λαιλαψ

‡ Ως δ' ὁτ' απο σκοπιης ειδεν νεφος αιπολος ανηρ,
Ερχομενον κατα ποντον υπο Ζεφυροιο ιωης,
Τω δ' τ' ανευθεν εοντι μελαντερον ηυτε πισσα
Φαινετ' ιων κατα πονλον, αγει δε τε Λαιλαπα πολλην. 275.

* Λιψ γαρ απο δυσμης χειμαρεινης πνει. do. 6.

† Θυελλα δε, πνευμα βιαιον και αφνω προσαλλομενον.
Λαιλαψ δε, πνευμα ειλουμενον καΐωθεν ανω. c. 4.

a whirl-

a whirlwind pent up, which burſts from below upwards. This latter agrees with the circumſtance mentioned here of the ſhepherd on an eminence ſeeing the whirlwind come along the ſea at a diſtance bound up in a black cloud. That theſe words ſhould have retained their ſenſes ſo exactly in the time of Ariſtotle or later indicates not only the accurate propriety, which is to be found in Homer's deſcriptions and language, but alſo that while he feigned manners of ſimplicity for his heroes of more antient days than his own, his own age ſeems to be hereby betrayed to us by his applying to early ages words and names of winds poſſibly adapted to the ſenſes of much later times.

We may now be able to decide concerning the ſenſe of another ſimile in the eleventh book, which Mr. Pope has again miſtaken, yet upon good authorities; for he implicitly followed Dacier, who followed Strabo, who ſeems to have either followed Eratoſthenes, or corrected him: but certainly none of them have followed Ariſtotle, who was a better judge, from opportunities of experience at leaſt, if not from accuracy of obſervation, becauſe he lived in Greece; whereas Eratoſthenes in Egypt could only explain the nature of the Grecian winds from more fallible ſpeculation, as Strabo from Bithynia did after him.

ανηλαρ

αυταρ επειτα
Πληθον, ὡς ὁποτε Ζεφυρος νεφεα ςυφελιξη,
Αργεσταο Νοτοιο βαθειῃ Λαιλαπι τυπτων.

ac deinde
Plebem, veluti quum Zephyrus nubes agitarit,
Velocis noti ingenti vortice (imbrifero) verberans.

Thus Bergler rightly ſtops theſe lines; for if a comma be made after ςυφελιξη, then Αργεσταο Νοτοιο will be governed of λαιλαπι, and mean, "that Zephyrus diſpells the clouds, repulſing them with a deep ſpread whirlwind of the ſoutherly Argeſtes;" but if the comma be placed after Νοτοιο, this word will then be governed by νεφεα; and will mean, "that Zephyrus diſpells the clouds brought by the ſoutherly Argeſtes, repulſing them with a deep ſpread whirlwind." The latter is the ſenſe of Strabo, Dacier, and Pope; but that Bergler has rightly preſerved the former ſenſe, may be juſtified by the foregoing quotations from Ariſtotle, together with the foregoing paſſage in Homer himſelf. In the foregoing paſſage, Juno unleſs very perverſe indeed, could never think of ſending a rainy wind, in order to make the flames ſpread the faſter about the Trojan camp, which were deſtined to burn up not only the graſs and trees, but even the river Scamander itſelf and the fiſh at the bottom of it: And in

fact we have found, that the Argeſtes Zephyrus was ſuch a dry ſudden wind as would anſwer Juno's purpoſe of diſpelling the clouds, and producing a clear ſky. Therefore in the preſent caſe, that Homer ſhould again diſtinguiſh what Zephyrus he meant by the appellation Αργεσταο Νοτοιο, may be reaſonably preſumed juſt as in the foregoing paſſage, making them here as there all act in union, not in oppoſition to each other; and the reaſon is plain, for Zephyrus has ſuch an extenſive meaning, that it marks out clearly no particular wind without ſuch an addition of peculiarity. The true meaning of λαιλαπς, *a whirlwind*, is alſo well ſuited to the nature of the Argeſtes, and to the ſenſe of both ſimilies, ſince this wind is deſcribed to be a ſtrong ruſhing wind, and its peculiar quality is to drive forward the clouds; neither ſimile includes any idea of rain: Bergler therefore ſhould have expunged *imbrifero*; at preſent he makes one ſtorm of rain repulſe another. In Odyſſ. xii. 314, λαιλαπς is again erroneouſly tranſlated *imbris*. But at v. 400 we find a λαιλαπς again, yet without any rain, which did not come until the λαιλαπς ceaſed. I think then I may venture to pronounce that Strabo miſled Dacier and Pope; his words are, violenter ſpirantem Zephyrum (dicit Homerus) quique *ab Argeſte noto congregata* diſſipare conſuevit, cum illa debilia exiſtant. Hæc cum ab Eratoſthene

thene dicantur, talem quandem habent emendationem. (Lib. i.) The tranſlation of Dacier is, *Semblable au violent Zephyre, qui de ſes ſouffles impetueux et groſſis d'orages, bat les nuées, qu'a raſſemblées le vent de midi.* Dacier has avoided the fault of Bergler; for *groſſis d'orages* do not include the idea of rain, only of ſtorms of wind; but in Homer it is the *vent de midi* which diſſipates, not brings up the clouds. In general it may be ſaid, that Dacier and Pope, by conjectural epithets of their own have made all the winds, at leaſt all the Zephyri, ſo much alike, as to loſe all thoſe peculiarities, which diſtinguiſh them in Homer.

P. 64. "I find two paſſages in the Odyſſey, which ſeem to give an Idea of Zephyrus, different from his general character, and more like the (ſoft) Zephyrus of modern Poetry. One is in the poets deſcription of the Elyſian plain—the other is in the deſcription of Alcinous's garden."—When we recollect that theſe two inſtances are the only ones in which he deſcribes the qualities of that wind in a diſtant weſtern climate, inſtead of contradiction and inconſiſtence, we diſcover an extenſive knowledge of nature.—He accommodates his deſcriptions to what he had either heard or ſeen of diſtant parts."

In oppoſition to this, it may be obſerved in the firſt place, that theſe are not the only places in which Homer deſcribes the qualities of the Zephyrus in a weſtern climate; neither does he give it leſs the quality of boiſterous in a weſtern climate, than on the coaſt of Ionia. For in the twelfth book of the Odyſſey, when Ulyſſes is ſailing on the coaſt of Italy near Scylla and Charybdis Eurylochus admoniſhes Ulyſſes of the danger of a *ſudden ſtorm from the boiſterous Zephyrus in the night.*

Ην πως εξαπινης ελθη ανεμοιο θυελλα
Η Νοτου, η Ζεφυροιο δυσαεος,

According to Mr. Wood's reaſoning we can only excuſe Homer here, by laying the blame upon Eurylochus, who forgot that he was got far to the weſtward of Alcinous's garden, and in a climate where the Zephyrus was gentle, not boiſterous. We may obſerve moreover that the word θυελλα and the quality of ſuddenneſs are here again applied to the Notus as well as Zephyrus, which is doubtleſs the ſame Notus argeſtes as before; this being the only wind eſteemed ſouthernly, which is deſcribed by Ariſtotle as poſſeſſing thoſe qualities. The ſouth and eaſt winds are the ſoft and gentle ones. However ſoon after a violent wind (ζαης ανεμος) accompanied with a λαιλαψ drove them to the Iſland of the Sun; whether Eurylochus propheſied

propheſied before rightly, that it would be a Zephyrus, does not appear. But when they left this iſland a *howling Zephyrus with a* λαιλαψ *and* θυελλα *certainly aroſe*, which drove him to the iſland of Calypſo.

Κεκληγως Ζεφυρος μεγαλη συν λαιλαπι θυων.
Ver. 400.

Certainly therefore Homer does not deſcribe the Zephyrus as gentle in a diſtant weſtern climate; and there may poſſibly be more proofs in the Odyſſey in oppoſition to this hypercriticiſm of Zephyrus being made to change its nature in diſtant parts. Being thus prepared not to expect any change of character, let us next examine, what nature is really aſcribed to Zephyrus in Elyſium and the garden of Alcinous, which was another Elyſium, but deſtined for living mortals; in both which we ſhall ſtill find, that it preſerves at leaſt ſome of thoſe qualities aſcribed to it in the eaſtern clime of Ionia. In Elyſium it is ſaid, "that there is neither ſnow, nor *much* winter, and never any ſtorms of rain but only the blowing of a whiſtling Zephyrus always the ſame."

Ου νιφελος, ουτ' αρ χειμων πολυς, ουτε ποθ' ομβρος:
Αλλ' αει Ζεφυροιο λιγυπνειουσας αησας.
Lib. iv. 566.

The

The word πολυς ſhews that Elyſium was not deſtitute of ſome degree of winter, and the word αηλας is the very ſame uſed before in the caſe of the boiſterous Zephyrus from Thrace; and we ſhall find λιγυς uſed alſo in caſes where the wind muſt have been more than gentle. In Lib. xiv. of Iliad, Homer ſpeaking of the appearance of the ſea before a ſtorm, expreſſes it "*before the rapid courſes of the whiſtling winds,*" λιγεων ανεμων λαιψηρα κελευθα. v. 17. Here λιγεων could ſcarcely mean nothing but *gentle.* Again in the fifth book he ſpeaks of the force of Boreas being aſleep, and alſo the other boiſterous winds, *which diſpel the dark clouds with their whiſtling blaſts.* v. 524.

μενος Βορεαο, και αλλων
Ζαχρειων ανεμων, οἱτε νεφεα σκιοεντα
Πνοιησιν λιγυρῃσι διασκιδναασιν αελλας.

Again in the thirteenth book he compares "*the duſt raiſed by an engagement between the armies to that raiſed by the blaſts of whiſtling winds.*

Ως υπο λιγεων ανεμων σπερχωσιν αελλαι. 334.

In all theſe caſes λιγυς muſt imply *whiſtling* at leaſt, if not ſomething more violent; and ſince the orientals of Aſia have as much too hot weather in ſummer as we have too little, it is no wonder that in their Elyſium the

the idea of a *briſk whiſtling wind* ſhould compoſe one part of the enjoyment of it. Mr. Wood himſelf teſtifies how ſtudiouſly they catch the northerly Eteſian winds in ſummer. It is therefore the Latin tranſlators with their *ſuaviter ſpirans*, Dacier with her *douces Haleines*, and Pope with his *fragrant murmurs*, it is theſe, who, by being prepoſſeſſed with the common wiſh for ſoft gentle Zephyrs in their own rough weſtern climate, have made Homer ſpeak like themſelves, and give a greater degree of gentleneſs to the Zephyrus of Elyſium, than his words really imply: they have accommodated to our ideas, what Homer had calculated for his own countrymen; who in this as well as in other caſes, has faithfully deſcribed one quality of Zephyrus in ſuch manner as it was known in Ionia, not in a diſtant weſtern clime. To his tranſlators tepid breezes to mitigate the rigor of winter was the predominant idea; but the leading thought in the oriental original is cooling breezes to moderate the heats of ſummer, as he himſelf expreſſes it, *to refreſh mankind*, αναψυχειν. The ſame obſervation extends to the other inſtance of the garden of Alcinous: in which the trees being deſcribed as eternally bearing fruit, ſome budding and others ripening at the ſame time upon the ſame trees, it was neceſſary, that the temperature of the air ſhould be deſcribed as not being too hot,

hot, any more than not being too cold, an eternal ſpring rather than an eternal ſummer: it was neceſſary therefore that Zephyrus ſhould be conſidered as having ſome briſkneſs in his breath, in order to preſerve this medium between heat and cold; and there appear no ſigns here either, that Homer intended to give any idea of a more ſoft Zephyrus, than that cooling and briſk one which his countrymen had been uſed to feel in Ionia at the time of the northerly and weſternly Eteſian winds in ſummer. Homer's thought alſo of the ſame trees, budding, bearing fruit, and ripening at the ſame time is not a mere romance: for in the laſt remark it will be ſeen, that both vines and figs of this kind were actually known in Greece, as Pliny ſays.

P. 69. " The winds which Homer employs, are adapted to the ſhips ſailing; to which Virgil does not pay the ſame attention. His deſcription of the departure of Æneas from Carthage, is not only inconſiſtent with truth and poſſibility, but contradictory to itſelf.

This accuſation of Virgil has no better foundation than the foregoing pretended juſtification of Homer, where he did not want any. He ſays, " Æneas ſailed from Carthage with a weſt wind, which is very improperly called favourable (Zephyros audis ſpirare ſecundos?) iv. 560."

Certainly

Certainly it was not unfavourable; for a ſide wind at weſt or eaſt is in general almoſt as favourable to carry a ſhip northward, (which was the courſe of Æneas from Carthage) as a directly ſouth wind *ex puppe*; and in the preſent caſe a weſt wind was for ſeveral particular reaſons more favourable. This objection is only a copy of an old remark in the Delphin Virgil, *ex Africa in Italiam ſolventibus, auſtro non Zephyro opus eſt.* But in Riedeſel's travels through Sicily, tranſlated by Foſter, he ſays, "He ſailed from Malta with a briſk weſterly wind, and landed at Cape Paſſaro (promontorium Pachynum)." This ſouth promontory lies due north from Malta; and this was nearly the ſame courſe as Æneas had to ſteer from Carthage to the weſt promontory of Sicily (Prom. Lilybæum); for which a weſterly wind was the more favourable, becauſe a ſouth wind too often brought ſtorms with it, while a weſt wind was more calm. Horace ſpeaks of *navim jactantibus Auſtris.* Sat. i. 6: and horridis Auſter fluctibus. Ep. x. 4. Another reaſon was, becauſe as the antients were accuſtomed to coaſting navigations only, a weſterly wind, altho' it ſhould prove too ſtrong, yet would be certain not to carry Æneas into the open Mediterranean ſea, but to drive him ſomewhere on the coaſt of Sicily; for which reaſon alſo it was better than an eaſterly one; which, if violent,

might drive him toward the Straights and away from Sicily and Italy. Mr. Wood goes on, "Before Æneas was out of ſight of Carthage, we find him purſuing his courſe with a north wind, which is ſtill more contrary to his intended courſe.

Interea, *medium* Æneas jam Claſſe tenebat,
Certus Iter, fluctus que atros *Aquilone* ſecabat."
v. 1.

Here again Mr. Wood ſeems to have followed the interpretation of the Delphin Virgil, which conſtructs *medium* along with *Iter*, as if he meant the mid way from Carthage to Sicily; but in the notes he would have ſeen, that *medium* meant *medium mare*, *plenum mare*; he was now got into the open ſea, therefore to the northward of Sicily and the promontorium Lilybæum: if the walls of Carthage are ſaid to be ſtill in ſight, yet even the words expreſs no more than that Æneas kept looking back upon thoſe walls *while* he was getting into *open* ſea; and *while* Dido was putting an end to her life; for the word *interea* reſtrains the ſenſe of *reſpiciens mœnia* to what paſſed in the *intermediate* time between his quitting the ſhore, and his laſt ſituation in *open* ſea, and the ſixth following verſe aſſtifies that *now* they were out of ſight of land——

Nec jam amplius ulla
Occurrit tellus, cælum undiq. et undiq. pontus.

However

However being now at open ſea, and therefore to the northward of the promontorium Lilybæum of Sicily, his courſe to Italy was directly eaſt; to which a north and ſide wind would carry him as well as a directly weſt wind; and indeed was a more favourable wind for the ſame reaſon as before, that is, a north wind would keep the ſhip near the north coaſt of Sicily, by blowing toward the ſhore; which in the coaſting navigation of thoſe times was what they wiſhed, for fear of being driven to open ſea out of ſight of land. Mr. Wood goes on "when in the evening he has gotten clear of land, the wind changed to the weſt, with every prognoſtic of a ſtormy night." But how does it appear, that it was now evening, and near a ſtormy night? the line—Noctem hyememque ferens, et inhorruit unda tenebris does not refer to the natural night, but only to the artificial one cauſed by the *cæruleus imber* before mentioned, and we ſhall find, that real night was come before. However the advantage of ſailing with a north wind becomes here evident; for Palinurus in the midſt of night foreſeeing the ſtorm, immediately ordered out the oars to row aſhore as faſt as poſſible, in which the north wind would have aſſiſted them, if it had continued: but though the favourable north wind was now changed, yet it does no where appear, that it was changed to a weſt wind;

wind; but quite the contrary, that is, to an eaſt wind; and it is remarkable, that the two lines which prove this are omitted in Mr. Wood's quotation, viz.

Mutati *tranſverſa* fremunt, et veſpere ab atro
Conſurgunt venti, atque in nubem cogitur aer.

Tranſverſa ſhews, that the wind, which ſucceeded the north wind was directly againſt their courſe to Italy, therefore an eaſt wind, or rather perhaps a complication of tranſverſe winds, if the plural number together with the prepoſition *con* be a ſecure foundation for ſuch a conſtruction. Mr. Wood adds, "Palinurus orders his men to reef their ſails and ply their oars, but finding it in vain to ſtruggle with this weſt wind, which was before called favourable, he conſults the ſtars in a dark night, and concludes that he is not far from Sicily." How ſtrong is the power of prejudice to produce miſrepreſentation! whether the technical term *obliquat que ſinus in ventum* means *to reef the ſails*, I will not pretend to determine, but he elſewhere calls this *vela legere*, iii. 531: I apprehend then it rather implies, that they let the ſails drive with the wind, that they might not catch any of it in the boſom of the ſail; that is, they gave over all thoughts of employing their ſails any more, and took to their oars. But whence does Mr. Wood conjure up this weſt wind again,

again, there is not a word about it in the latin; unleſs he has here again interpreted Virgil under the guidance of thoſe profound criticiſms in the notes, and in what is called the *interpretatio* annexed to the Delphin Virgil, which render *veſpere ab atro* by *ab obſcuro occidente*: but this is certainly not their meaning; Palinurus only tells Æneas in thoſe words, that "tranſverſe winds roſe as ſoon as the night began to be dark." *Ab* marks here the *time from* which the tranſverſe winds firſt began to blow, and not the *quarter* of the heavens, *from* which they blowed. *Veſpere* has its proper ſenſe of the *evening*, and not a metonymical one for the *quarter* of the heavens in which the ſun ſets; neither is there a ſingle inſtance in Virgil, where *veſper* is ever thus uſed as a metonymy for the *weſt*. This is alſo one of the proper ſenſes of *ab*; juſt as Plautus ſays, *ab aurora*, from the time of the dawn; and Livy *ab ſole orto*, from the time of ſunriſing; Cicero *ab hora tertia*; and Martial *a media nocte*. It is alſo a Greek phraſe, and the whole ſentence of Virgil is copied from Homer,

Εκ νυκλων δ' ανεμοι χαλεποι, δηλημαλα νηων,
Γινονλαι.

Ex noctibus autem venti graves, pernicies navium,
Surgunt. Odyſſ. xii. 286.

After-

Afterwards indeed a weſt wind aroſe, when the ſhip was got near ſhore *Petunt Portus, et vela ſecundi intendunt Zephyri*; and here Zephyrus is again called favourable, and juſtly, as it ſprung up at a favourable time: for thoſe tranſverſe and eaſterly winds continuing might have blown them to the weſtward of the weſt end of Sicily, where the port of Eryx ſtood; but a weſtern gale ſpringing up at the moment they were driven oppoſite to the promontory and near port, carried them happily in; and therefore is ſtyled *ſecundus*. It appears then that this ſtorm did not happen *near evening* but the whole of it actually in the night, and not until after it was dark night, that is full night, *veſpere ab atro*. It hence appears alſo that there is no ſuch contradiction as Mr. Wood pretends, as if Palinurus conſulted the ſtars in a dark night; for Palinurus only ſpeaks of an obſervation taken in the firſt part of the night before the ſtorm came on, and while the ſtars yet appeared, before it was *veſper ater*; which he preſerved in his memory, (ſi ritè memor) and compared with the courſe of the ſhip ſince, which was plainly backward, that is, from eaſt to weſt, (ſince the tranſverſe winds roſe) until they reached the port Eryx: neither does he conclude from this recollected obſervation (as Mr. Wood pretends) that he is not far from Sicily; but that he was now not far from that part

part of Sicily, where the port Eryx was; and this he does not ſpeak of as a certainty, which he concluded from a *preſent* obſervation taken in the midſt of the ſtorm, but only as what he gueſſed (*reor*) from the courſe they had held ſince his laſt obſervation, in the beginning of the night before the ſtorm began; in which obſervation the word *remetior* relates to ſtill more antient obſervations taken in the preceding year, when the fleet was at the very next port of Drepanum, cloſe to Eryx and the promontory of Lilybæum.

It may be proper to ſubjoin here ſome remarks on other cenſures of Virgil by Mr. Wood at *p.* 229: He ſays, "Æneas arrives at Carthage in the ſeventh ſummer of his voyages; and in the next he ſolemnizes the funeral games in Sicily, in the ſeventh year after the deſtruction of Troy. If he is right in the firſt calculation, he muſt be at leaſt a year miſtaken in the laſt." No, not miſtaken in either, and I thought this objection had been already ſufficiently anſwered in the Delphin Virgil, from whence it is taken. Æneas ſays, that he ſailed from Aſia, at the very beginning of ſummer, Vix prima inceperat æſtas. Lib. iii. 8. Dido ſays to him, that his ſeventh year is now begun, ſince he became a wanderer.

Te jam ſeptima portat
Omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus Æſtas.

On

On which the Delphin annotator juſtly obſerves, that there is no contradiction between theſe words and what is ſaid in Lib. v. 626. Septima poſt Trojæ excidium jam vertitur Æſtas; for *jam vertitur* means *jam tranſacta eſt, et vertitur in octavam*; the ſeventh is now completed, viz. at the end of ſpring, which was begun in the preceding ſummer, when Æneas was driven to Carthage. That Æneas ſailed from Carthage ſoon after winter, and before the end of the ſeventh year, is plain from the reproach Dido makes to him, while he was preparing his fleet, i. e. that he was ſo tired of her company as to be about ſailing even in winter.

Quin etiam hyberno moliris Sydere Claſſem
Et mediis properas Aquilonibus ire per altum. iv. 309.

And when he arrived at Eryx, he ſays, that it was now one whole year ſince he had buried his father at the next port of Drepanum, juſt before he ſailed from Sicily, and was driven to Carthage.

Annuus exactis completur menſibus orbis
Ex quo reliquias divinique oſſa parentis
Condidimus terra. v. 46.

That *æſtas* is often uſed to mean *year* none need to be told. Where then is the contradiction and pretended miſtake?

Mr.

Mr. Wood goes on *p.* 330, "Caſſandra had laid open to Anchiſes the deſtination of his family for Italy—yet in a few lines after, we ſee the Trojans embark without knowing where to go. Æneas turns his back upon this promiſed land and ſails for Thrace, which though in his neighbourhood he deſcribes as a diſtant country. —Little inaccuracies of the ſame kind are not to be found ſo frequently in Homer." This inaccuracy however is more frequent in Homer; indeed in both it is the neceſſary conſequence of foreknowledge among mankind. It was in like manner foretold in Homer what would be the fate of Troy on one ſide, and of Achilles on the other, yet the agents on both ſides act nevertheleſs upon ſuch human and probable motives of action as preſent themſelves at any particular inſtant of time, though they ſhould tend to counteract Fate, not agreeably to the hints concerning the deſtination of Fate in ſome future period: To act the former way is conſiſtent with both poetic and hiſtoric truth, to act the latter would be inconſiſtent with both. In the preſent caſe, although it was foretold by Creuſa's ghoſt, that Æneas ſhould find a ſettlement on the Tiber in Heſperia; yet Æneas neither knew where Heſperia was, nor the way thither, it being to the Aſians, as Mr. Wood elſewhere confeſſes, conſidered as the utmoſt region of the world, as a kind of terra incognita;

which Æneas alſo teſtifies himſelf, incerti quo fata ferant ubi ſiſtere detur. 7. and Homer always uſes εσπεριων to mean the moſt weſtern regions, not Italy in particular †: but if Æneas did know where Heſperia was, yet there were preſent motives of action of a more urgent nature; ſuch as the neceſſity of quitting the Trojan realm as ſoon as poſſible, through fear of the Greeks; and the probability of finding a friendly ſecurity for the preſent at leaſt in Thrace, on account of its having been *Hoſpitium antiquum Trojæ ſociique penates*; neither is Thrace deſcribed as a *diſtant* country, but Mr. Wood has conſtructed *procul* with the wrong noun. Virgil did not mean *terra procul* "a land far off *;" but *vaſtis campis procul*, i. e. this land is inhabited in vaſt extended plains *to a great diſtance*. *Procul* in either ſenſe is an adverb here, and may juſt as well mean *at a great diſtance from thence*, procul iſtinc, as *at a great diſtance from hence*, procul hinc. Now Virgil ſeems to have added *procul* on purpoſe to point out, that this courſe of Æneas was ſuited to the words of Creuſa's prediction,

Longa tibi exilia et vaſtum maris æquor arandum,
Ad terram Heſperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
Inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Tybris.
ii. 780.

* Odyſſey, viii. 29.

† Terra procul vaſtis colitur mavortia campis. 13.

Æneas

Æneas did not turn his back upon the promiſed land, but ſailed not without ſome hopes, that ſome of the diſtant and weſtermoſt parts of Thrace might be the land of Heſperia in queſtion; but it muſt be obſerved alſo, that he had no knowledge of his deſtined fate for Heſperia except from the ghoſt of Creuſa, on which kind of prediction from departed ſouls the antients did not place any certain reliance, often not even upon the predictions of *living vates*, ſuch as Caſſandra, as we ſhall ſoon ſee; of whoſe prediction however Æneas then knew nothing, but only Anchiſes, as will appear afterwards. Such an imperfect information therefore as that of Creuſa could not be a ſufficient motive to Æneas for neglecting all probable hopes of ſettlement nearer home, in order to embark at firſt for ſuch a diſtant and unknown country. It is for this reaſon, that on quitting Thrace they ſailed to Delos, in order to conſult the oracle of the god Apollo, and gain clearer information concerning their deſtiny, whom they addreſſed with theſe queſtions:

Quem ſequimur? quove ire jubes? ubi ponere ſedes?
Da, Pater, Augurium.

But ſtill they got nothing but ambiguous intelligence; Apollo only told them to ſeek for the

antient country, whence their anceſtors iſſued, *antiquam exquirite matrem.* On this Anchiſes ſet himſelf to recollect the hiſtory of his anceſtors, veterum volvens monumenta virorum; and the firſt thought which occurred to him was concerning Crete, from which Teucer came to Troy, eſpecially as it was then near to them. But being diſappointed there alſo, the *dii Penates* at laſt cleared up the oracle, and relieved them from their uncertainty, by information on which they could depend, telling Æneas, that what the ancients called Heſperia, was now called Italy, and that this was the place *. They had now *for the firſt time* ſuch a certain prediction from the Gods themſelves, as could juſtify the attempt at ſuch a diſtant expedition; and this firſt brought to the memory of Anchiſes what Caſſandra had foretold to himſelf in private, but to which he had given no belief, any more than the other Trojans had to her predictions concerning them; which again proves, that until *now*, they had no ſufficiently clear information for them to follow in preference to any other preſent rational motives of action. Anchiſes ſays,

Sola mihi tales Caſus Caſſandra canebat;
Nunc repeto hæc generi portendere debita noſtro

* Heſperiam Graii cognomine dicunt;
Nunc Fama Minores
Italiam dixiſſe.

Et

Et ſæpe Heſperiam, ſæpe Itala regna vocare.
185.

Sed quis ad Heſperiæ venturos littora Teucros
Crederet? aut quem *tum* vates Caſſandra moveret?

This explication of the Gods, that the *terra antiqua*, called Heſperia, was in later times called Italy, cleared up to Anchiſes the difficulty; who confeſſes, that while the kingdom of Priam was in glory, Italy was ſuch a diſtant realm, that none could think of their ever travelling to it. It is no wonder alſo that Anchiſes gave no heed to ſuch predictions then; ſince we find that even later and in the midſt of danger the Trojans equally diſregarded the predictions of Caſſandra concerning the Greek horſe.

Tunc etiam fatis aperit Caſſandra futuris,
Ora, dei juſſu, non unquam credita Teucris.
ii. 246.

Upon the whole then there is no room for accuſing Virgil of inaccuracy, but on the contrary he has managed all theſe predictions in the beſt poſſible manner, better perhaps than Homer; and almoſt reconciled what can ſcarcely be reconciled, a foreknowledge of Fate with the freedom of human actions, and the ſuggeſtions of probable motives of human conduct; which muſt always ſo claſh with one another, as to make

make the agents appear either in ſome degree abſurd for acting in oppoſition to the divine decree, or elſe they muſt ceaſe to be guided by ſuch views as were rational in their reſpective ſituations. It was the popular belief of predictions, which gives all the force to ſuch a cenſure, and not the conduct of Virgil.

Mr. Wood proceeds in his cenſure, "that when Æneas ſailed from Thrace to Delos, it it was with a wind, which could not carry him thither." Here again he copies the Delphin Virgil, which ſays, *Euntibus è Thracia in Delum Auſter contrarius, Boreas commodus eſt*; to which remark they were led by Æneas's ſpeaking of *dare Claſſibus Auſtros*. 61. and again *vocat Auſter in altum*. 70. But neither of theſe critics have comprehended the meaning of Æneas. It is plain, that Æneas on his firſt arrival in Thrace, intended to fix there; for he ſays, *Mœnia prima loco*; but how long he did really remain there may be a matter of doubt. We know that he arrived at Carthage in the ſeventh year of his voyages; but Virgil only in one place expreſsly points out *, how long he remained in any particular place, or where he ſpent his winters, during which time the antients never ventured on the ſea: we can only collect it from circumſtances; he probably

* iii. 284.

thought

thought it an accuracy more fit for an annaliſt than a poet. Now in the preſent caſe, that Æneas remained in Thrace all the ſucceeding winter until the ſpring, may be collected from ſeveral expreſſions; the critics in queſtion ſuppoſe, that he left it immediately after the affair of Polydorus; and to this they were probably led by the words

Omnibus idem animus, ſcelerata excedere Terra
Linquere pollutum Hoſpitium, et dare Claſſibus
Auſtros.

But none of theſe phraſes determine that they left it immediately, and only that they were determined not to fix their reſidence there: the laſt words however add a ſtrong hint, that they intended to ſtay until the ſpring, when by the arrival of the mild weather, which the ſouthery winds bring at that ſeaſon, the ſea ſhould again become open to navigation, as the antients commonly expreſſed themſelves. That this is the meaning of *dare Claſſibus Auſtros* may be confirmed by the ſeventieth line, wherein he mentions their departure,

Inde ubi prima Fides Pelago, placataque venti
Dant Maria, et lenis crepitans vocat Auſter in
altum
Deducunt Socii Naves.

Æneas had hitherto met with no ſtorm; what then can he mean by the *prima Fides Pelago*, and

and *placata Maria*? Theſe words imply ſome preceding rough weather; by which he ſeems to have meant the uſual rough weather in winter and no other. All the terms at leaſt are adapted to this ſenſe, although indeed they may alſo imply no more, than the arrival of calm weather at any time of the year; but as Æneas muſt neceſſarily have laid up his ſhips ſomewhere during the winters of his ſix years voyages, the firſt might as well be ſpent here as elſewhere. When the ſoutherly winds began to blow at the end of winter, this was the index of the return of ſpring, and the arrival of the ſeaſon for navigation; as alſo the continuance of northerly winds was often uſed to expreſs the continuance of winter: thus Dido reproaches Æneas, when ſhe perceived him preparing to leave Carthage, that he was in ſuch haſte to quit her, as even to venture out to ſea during the northerly winds, meaning before the arrival of ſpring. *Mediis properas Aquilonibus ire per altum.* iv. 310. again, *Glacialis Hyems Aquilonibus aſperat undas.* iii. 285. on the other hand Ariſtotle ſays, πνεουσι δὲ νοτοι προς, *The ſouth winds blow in the ſpring.* Probl. xxv. 2. He even determines how long after the winter Solſtice the firſt ſoutherly wind may be expected, viz. on the fifteenth day; εστι δε και ἡ μελα τας χειμερινας τροπας πνεῖ και δεκαῖη Νοτιος, and adds the reaſon for it. ditto, 13.

again

again in the ſeventeenth, "Why do the ſouthernly winds blow at the beginning of winter and the beginning of ſpring." * So that to wait for the *Auſtri* is almoſt a ſynonimous phraſe to waiting for the ſpring. But even if any one ſhould think, that Æneas did not remain in Thrace all winter, yet another paſſage in Ariſtotle ſhews, that Virgil fell into no impropriety in the above expreſſions; for Ariſtotle ſays, it was a common proverb, that thoſe who wiſhed for a happy voyage, *ought to ſail when the north wind ceaſed, and the ſoutherly wind began* †. Æneas might therefore mention the arrival of a ſouthernly wind, only becauſe it promiſed a fit ſeaſon for venturing out to ſea, not becauſe it was a fit wind to carry him from Thrace to Delos. But laſtly, another phraſe ſeems rather to confirm, that he really ſtaid all winter; for he adds, *Deducunt ſocii naves*, i. e. My companions draw down the veſſels from the ſhore and launch them into the ſea. Now it does not appear, that it was ever the practice of the antients to draw their veſſels on the ſhore, except during the winter ſeaſon. Accordingly when Horace gives us a picture of the arrival of ſpring, he makes the launching of ſhips a conſpicuous part of it.

* Διὰ τι οἱ Νότοι πνέουσι μεν χειμωνος και εαρος αρχομενου.

† Ἡ παροιμια λεγει Ευπλειν "Αρχομενου τε Νοτου και ληγοντος Βορεαο." Probl. xxvi. 48.

Solvitur acris Hyems grata vice veris et Favonî,
Trahuntque ſiccas Machinæ Carinas.
Od. i. 4.

Neither do we afterwards in all the narration of Æneas meet with any ſimilar phraſe, until he left Carthage, where we know he ſtayed all the winter: He then ſays, *Littore celſas deducunt toto naves.* iv. 388. But in other places he only ſpeaks of caſting anchor, and fixing the ſterns of the ſhips to the ſhore, "anchora de prora jacitur, ſtant Littore Puppes. iii. 277." There is no better foundation then for theſe cenſures of Virgil, than for the foregoing commendations of Homer of the *recherché* kind.

P. 195. "There is a wretched piece of wit of Mneſilochus preſerved, which plays upon the ſynonimous term of Phrygian and Trojan. It was ſuppoſed, that Euripides was obliged to Socrates for aſſiſting him in his tragedies. When his Troes appeared, Mneſilochus in one of his comic pieces obſerved, *that Socrates had ſupplied Fuel to kindle the Fire of that play*; and inſtead of Τρωες he called it Φρυγες for the ſake of jingle in the word and a reſemblance to Φρυγιον and Φρυγανον, which ſignified dry wood, ſuch as a fire is lighted with.

Φρυγες

Φρυγες εσὶι καινον δραμα τουτ' Ευριπιδȣ,
Ωι και Σωκρατης τα Φρυγανα ὑποτιθησι."

Phryges eſt novum hoc drama Euripidis,
Cui etiam Socrates Fragmenta ſuppeditat.

I ſhall not pretend to defend the excellence of a pun, but I know no reaſon why a pun ſhould be a more wretched piece of wit in Greek than in Engliſh. However let its demerit be ever ſo great, it ſeems plain that Mr. Wood has intirely miſunderſtood the meaning of the words, and the tendency of the ſatire contained in the pun againſt Euripides; which depends chiefly upon the ſenſe of ὑποτιθησι; the primary and common meaning of which is doubtleſs *ſupplied* in general; but it has alſo another common and ſecondary ſenſe, viz. *to give or ſupply counſel* (συμβουλευειν *Heſych.*), thence the rhetoricians and philoſophers formed a third ſenſe, and a merely ſcientific one, i. e. to deliver philoſophic tenets as from a profeſſor, eſpecially maxims of moral philoſophy. In this laſt meaning it is uſed by Iſocrates, Plato, Ariſtotle and others, and this is the meaning here alſo. Examples from Iſocrates and Plato may be ſeen in Scapula's Lexicon; and I ſhall add one more from Ariſtotle's Art of Rhetoric, "Praiſe and precepts are of one common ſpecies of compoſition;" for whatever *moral precepts a ſpeaker*

may deliver (υποθοιο αν) while he is giving counſel to the audience, the ſame being changed by a little different form of expreſſion only, become encomiums to the perſon of whom he ſpeaks; for ſince an audience already knows what things a man ought to practiſe, and what moral qualities he ought to have, a ſpeaker in delivering the ſame truths in the manner of moral precepts (ως υποθηκας) ought ſo to alter his form of expreſſion, that they ſhall at the ſame time have the force of commendation to him of whom he ſpeaks, as for inſtance, if a ſpeaker ſays, *that a man ought not to think highly of events which happen through good fortune, but rather of ſuch as depend altogether on his own good conduct*; whatever is thus ſpoken has the force of a moral precept (υποθηκην); but if the phraſe be changed into the following form, it will be turned into praiſe; *the perſon* (of whom we ſpeak) *not thinking highly of events which happen through good fortune, but rather of ſuch as depend on his own good conduct*: ſo that when you are willing to praiſe your client, conſider what moral precept you might beſt deliver conſiſtently with his conduct (τι αν υποθοιο); and when you deſire really to recommend a moral precept to the audience, conſider how far you might be able juſtly to commend your client for the ſame (otherwiſe your pre-

cept will ſtand in contradiction to his actions)."*

Having thus ſhewn the proper ſenſe of υποτιθησι, we can be at no loſs to diſcern the true meaning of Mneſilochus, namely to ridicule Euripides for the many formal maxims of morality, which he puts into the mouths of his ſpeakers in tragedy without reſpect to age, rank, or other circumſtances of their characters, he ſays that "This Phryges is the new kind of drama of Euripides, in which the philoſopher Socrates again dictates his muſty ſcraps of moral precepts." Although the pun is loſt in this tranſlation, yet the ſenſe and ſatire is preſerved; but in Mr. Wood's hands it is indeed a mere caput mortuum. Laertius reports that Socrates was ſaid to have aſſiſted Euripides in his tragedies, and brings theſe lines of Mneſilochus as a proof of it: now the character of Socrates as a moraliſt, and the new tragic manner of Euripides in ſtuffing his tragedies full of moral precepts introduced on all occaſions

* Εχει δι κοινον ειδος ὁ επαινος, καί ἀι συμβουλαι· ἀ γαρ εν τω συμβουλευειν ὑποθοιο αν, ταυτα μετατεθεντα τη λεξει, εγκωμια γινεται. επει ουν εχομεν ἀ δει πραττειν, και ποιαν τινα ειναι, δει ταυτα, ως ὑποθηκας λεγοντας, τη λεξει μετατιθεναι και στρεφειν· οιον, ὁτι ου δει μεγα φρονειν επι τοις δια τυχην, αλλα τοις δι ἀυτον· ὑυτω μεν ουν λεχθεν, ὑποθηκην δυναται· ὠδι δε, επαινον· μεγα φρονων, ε τοις δια τυχην ὑπαχουσιν, αλλα τοις δι αυτον. ωστε ὁταν επαινειν βουλη, ὁρα τι αν ὑποθοιο· και οταν ὑποθεσθαι, ὁρα τι αν επαινεσειας. Rhetoric. ii. 9.

with-

without regard to propriety, ought naturally to lead us to think, that it was in this article of morality, that Socrates was ſuppoſed by the antients to have aſſiſted Euripides. This is alſo the moſt natural and proper meaning of the above lines, as is teſtified by the ſcientific word υποδιδησι which almoſt neceſſarily ties down φρυγανα, to mean only ſuch kind of *ſcraps* (quiſquiliæ vet. Gloſ. *riff-raff)* as a moral preceptor would deliver. We find alſo by Ariſtophanes, that theſe were actually an object of ridicule againſt Euripides among the antients, as they have alſo been juſtly among modern critics; I mean the incongruous manner in which they are often thruſt into the mouths of his ſpeakers. Φρυγανα is explained as meaning *old dry ſhreds of wood, ſweepings, or any riff-raff*, fit for nothing but to light fires with; it naturally coincides therefore with our phraſe, *old dry muſty ſcraps of morality.* Καινον δραμα may juſt as well mean a new ſpecies of drama, as a new tragedy; και *etiam* expreſſes, that this practice had been objected to in Euripides before, and was now *again* renewed in this tragedy. This is what Ariſtophanes ſeems to allude to in his *Ranes*, wherein he ridicules Æſchylus and Euripides alternately, by putting ſuch obſervations into their mouths, as tend to condemn ſometimes each other, and ſometimes themſelves. He makes Euripides therefore boaſt

boaſt in act 4. ſc. 1. "That from the very firſt lines of his own tragedies he never admits any idle ſenſeleſs ſtuff; for both his maid and men ſervants talk as well and as much as their maſter, or his daughter as any old woman whatever;" who are always full of their wiſe ſayings and moral proverbs.

Ευριπ.—Απο των πρωΐων επων ουδεν παρηκ' αν αργον,
Αλλ' ελεγεν ἡ γυνη τε μοι, χω δουλος, ουδεν ηττον,
Χω δεσποτης, χἠ παρθενος, χἠ γραυς αν.—

And a few lines before he had boaſted alſo, "that he had enriched his ſpeeches with the very marrow of all the ſtuff which could be picked out of books and moral philoſophy." Χυλον διδους στωμυλματων απο βιβλιων, απ' ηθων. Succum inſerens Blattaramentorum è Libris et morali doctrina. In his *Nubes* alſo Phædippides is made to condemn every one, who will not allow Euripides to be the moſt eminent poet *in moral wiſdom* (σοφωΐατον); that he meant *moral wiſdom* by this word appears by the words of the preceding ſpeaker, who being deſired to give an example of ſuch *moral wiſdom* from Euripides (ἀτε εσΐι τα σοφα ταυτα) produces *a ſpeech* from his Poet (ρησιν) wherein is related *by what means a Brother committed inceſt with his Siſter*; thereby ironically refut-

ing

ing the pretended morality of this poet. Laertius alſo after quoting the above lines of Mneſilochus in proof that Socrates aſſiſted Euripides, immediately brings another proof from Ariſtophanes out of the firſt part of his *Nubes*, which is loſt, wherein he introduces ſomebody ſaying, "This is Euripides, the compoſer of thoſe tragedies ſo much prated of as being moral ones:" and adds, "that Socrates was author of it." Σωκρατης γαρ αιτιος.

Ευριπιδης δ', ὁ τας τραγῳδιας ποιων
Τας περιλαλυσας, υἱος εστι, τας σοφας.

This expreſsly fixes upon the morality of his tragedies, as being what Socrates was ſuppoſed to have aſſiſted in, and therefore confirms the meaning which I have given to φρυγανα υποτιθησι.

P. 238. "Critics compliment Homer for having enriched his language with the different dialects of Greece; though the diſtinction of dialects can be only known to a cultivated and in ſome degree ſettled ſtate of languages, as deviations from an acknowledged ſtandard. They point out his poetical licences, forgetting that in his time there were no compoſitions in proſe. They ſettle his pronunciation by an alphabet which he did not know, and by characters which he never ſaw."

Whether

Whether the critics are juſtly blamed here let us enquire. Certainly Mr. Wood is miſtaken in the firſt place, to aſſert that a diſtinction of dialects can be only known to a cultivated ſtate of language; for as dialects are the derivatives and different modifications of one common original, ſo both theſe derivations and the common original itſelf may be all equally barbarous and uncultivated. For inſtance, the barbarous Gothic was the common original of Engliſh, French, Dutch, German, and Daniſh; which latter are therefore dialects; but the Gothic itſelf, in its more antient ſtate contained as many different dialects then, as prevail now; yet the former were all of an equally uncultivated kind, and all in a moſt unſettled ſtate. The modern dialects of the ſame are in a greater degree of cultivation; and if ſome are in higher repute than others as an acknowledged ſtandard, it is only becauſe ſome have been modified in later times with greater degrees of refinement than others, and not that they were not formerly all equally barbarous deſcendants of one common and barbarous original: but thoſe which are now leſs refined may even ſtill certainly be enriched from the others, as they all might formerly from one another. In like manner the Pelaſgic and Ionic united were the common mother of the Grecian dialects, ſome of which became

modified at laſt with greater refinements than the Doric and others, which were conſidered as the coarſe, broad, ruſtic dialects in later ages; but that they were always ſo, is no way certain. Although the Attic got the preference in later ages, long after Homer, it does not appear, but that others might be thought more refined, elegant, and faſhionable in the time of Homer, when Attica made no figure either in the literary or political world. It is then a juſt obſervation of the critics, that of whatever country Homer was, he enriched his own language by a mixture of different dialects of the Greek tongue; out of which we may reaſonably ſuppoſe, that he ſelected only ſuch, as were eſteemed faſhionable and more elegant than others, or at leaſt more nervous, although now we cannot always determine what theſe were, or why they ſhould be thought more elegant than other modes; cuſtom and faſhion, not reaſon, are we know too often the *norma loquendi*; and even in the moſt refined times of language, Poets have always thought it an embelliſhment to introduce many antiquated words, now no longer faſhionable, when they ſeemed capable of adding ſtrength and weight to their compoſitions, as both Virgil and Milton have done.

Mr. Wood adds another cenſure of the critics, namely, that they point out Homer's poetic

poetic licences, forgetting that in his time there were no compoſitions in proſe: but has not Mr. Wood forgot, that altho' men did not then write in proſe, yet at leaſt they ſpoke in proſe? and as written proſe is but an improved copy of ſpoken proſe, a deviation from the latter is as much a licence as from the former. Mr. Wood's next cenſure, that the critics ſettle Homer's pronunciation by an alphabet which he did not know, is a fit counterpart to what he maintains at p. 148, that Homer could neither read nor write; and his reaſon for the former aſſertion is a fit counterpart to both, "for (ſays he) the twenty-four letters of the Ionian alphabet were not in uſe till after Homer's time." Now of theſe twenty-four it is ſaid indeed that four were added by Simonides, but four alſo by Palamedes about the time of the ſiege of Troy; which four laſt therefore, with the ſixteen original letters, were certainly invented before Homer's time; but the four of Simonides added after Homer are no way neceſſary to pronunciation; two of them being the vowels H and Ω to diſtinguiſh thoſe long ſounds from the ſhort ſounds of the ſame vowels ε and ο; ſuch a diſtinction does not even yet obtain in Engliſh nor in ſcarce any modern language. The other two letters were Z and Ψ, the ſounds of which could juſt as well have been expreſſed before by Σ and ΠΣ; for *S* is even ſtill in

Engliſh, French, and Italian often pronounced like *Z*, although theſe languages have the character *Z* to denote its proper ſound; the like practice would occaſion no greater difficulty in Homer's time, than we find now; and the character Ψ for ΠΣ is of no uſe at all. The want therefore of all theſe four letters could be no impediment to Homer's knowing the Greek alphabet as well as we, nor to later critics in fixing or comprehending his pronunciation: and as to what Mr. Wood adds in a note, that the letters of that age were all capitals and had no ſtops, this would be equally a proof that Thucydides or Herodotus could neither read nor write; for the ſame kind of letters prevailed even down to their age and much later. In fine, the whole of theſe remarks are ſuch a continued paradox, as are to be only equalled by that of a German author, who publiſhed a thick latin volume to prove Homer to have ſtolen his poems from the Jewiſh ſcriptures, or of an Engliſh writer who has not long ſince maintained them to be a tranſlation from the Celtic; a thief Homer certainly muſt have been, if the reputed author of ſuch a poem of merit could neither read nor write.

The above paradoxes, and many other contradictions ſeem to take their riſe from an error (as it ſeems to me) common to Mr. Wood with

with other critics, which is, that Homer lived in a more early age, than he really did. What has chiefly led critics into a belief of this high antiquity of the poet has been the ſimple, rough, and often ſavage manners of his heroes, and a groundleſs ſuppoſition, that he has deſcribed the manners prevalent in his own age. Mr. Wood ſuppoſes, "that the firſt intereſting ſtories Homer heard when a boy, were of the exploits at Troy;" (p. 216) "and that he had finiſhed both his poems about half a century after the town was taken." But the manners which he deſcribes, can be no proof of the age in which he lived; for by the rules of his art as an epic poet, it would have been abſurd, if writing of an antient event, he had not ſuited the characters of his agents to the times, in which he laid the plan of his poem. Virgil, who wrote ſo long after, gives the like ſimple manners to his agents; all tragic poets in modern times endeavour to adapt the manners and ſentiments of their characters in ſome degree at leaſt to the country, and ages when they are ſuppoſed to have lived. Why then ſhould critics ſuppoſe, that Homer might not do the ſame? and that although living himſelf in a poliſhed age, he had the good ſenſe not to aſcribe to the rough warriors at Troy the refined manners of his own times. It was more eaſy for Homer to give to his Heroes the leſs poliſhed

caſt of an age long before his own, than to have anticipated in idea a ſtate of refinement in language, metre, and arts, which Greece had not arrived at until a time future to that in which he lived: now there are ſuch internal teſtimonies in his poems of refinement, as ſtand in direct contradiction to the roughneſs of his characters, and prove, that as either the one or the other could not be the real ſtate of his own times, it muſt moſt probably be the manners of his heroes, which are feigned, agreeably to the demands of epic poetry.

Pope has juſtly obſerved, that Homer's invocation Ημεις δε κλεος οιον ακουομεν, ουδε τι ιδμεν. Il. ii. 487, ſhews that he lived long after the ſiege of Troy. And Paterculus has alſo juſtly remarked of Homer's expreſſion οιον νυν βροτοι εισι, *Hôc ut hominum ita Sæculorum notatur differentia.* l. 1. Poſſibly Ariſtotle alſo meant by αρχαιων in the following paſſage *more antient* than Homer's time, not than his own. *This is manifeſt alſo from the antient political ſocieties, which Homer imitates* †. Moreover, Homer mentions the *Gygæa lacus* in Lydia: now if what ſome writers ſay be true, that this lake was ſo named from Gyges, king of Lydia *,

† Δηλον δε τουτο και εκ των αρχαιων πολιτειων, ας Ομηρος εμιμειτο. *Nic. Mor.* iii. 5.

* Γυγαιη τεκε λιμνη. 2 Il. 372. vid. Sopinger in a note to the word Γυγαιη in Heſychius's Lexicon.

Homer

Homer could not have lived until after Gyges, therefore not above one hundred years before Solon, in which age Plutarch places him on the authority of ſome traditions. The epithet which Homer adds to the name of Carians (βαρβαροφωνων) confirms this ſuppoſition ‡; for the Carians are not recorded as having given up themſelves to maritime affairs, and letting themſelves out as ſoldiers to foreign nations, until a little before the time of Pſammetichus, king of Egypt; who hired numbers of them into his armies, and firſt admitted foreigners to acceſs into Egypt. Now their epithet of βαρβαροφωνων was (as ſome contend) given them on account of the corruption of their then native Greek tongue, by theſe foreign expeditions; whole bodies of them remained in Egypt a long time, as Herodotus relates, and as is confirmed by the Jewiſh ſcriptures, where they are called Lydians. Euſebius places theſe firſt migrations of the Carians about twenty years before Gyges, and ſixty before Pſammetichus, therefore about one hundred and ſeventy before Solon.

Again, the mention made in the Odyſſey of various articles of luxury and elegance betrays a later age, than is uſually aſſigned to the poet; and ſhews that he muſt have lived in more

‡ Ναστης αυ Καρων ηγησατο βαρβαροφωνων. 2 Il. 374.

civilized

civilized times, than can be conſiſtent with the rough and ſimple manners, which he feigns for his heroes in the Iliad. In the deſcription of Alcinous's palace and gardens, the pavement before the gates was of braſs (χαλκεον ουδον). Odyſ. vii. 83. for by his comparing it to the ſplendor of the ſun or moon, it muſt be ſomething more than the threſhold. The walls on each ſide were alſo of braſs (χαλκεοι τοιχοι ενθα και ενθα). The doors within were of gold (χρυσειαι θυραι ενδος εεργον). The poſts to the brazen gates were of ſilver (Αργυρεοι σταθμοι). The lintel over the doors of ſilver alſo (Αργυρεον δ' εφ' υπερθυριον). The knocker of gold (χρυσεη κορωνη). Statues of dogs in gold and ſilver guarded the gate, formed with great ſkill (ιδυιησι πραπιδεσσι). Thrones and broidered convivial robes for the chiefs at their feaſts were placed within; golden ſtatues of youths ſtood at the altars with lighted torches fixed in their hands to illuminate the houſe. Fifty were kept employed in weaving or embroidery. A garden of four acres was planted with olives, grapes, figs, apples, pears, pomgranates, and and other fruits, with fountains both for uſe and pleaſure. Are theſe ideas ſuitable to the roughneſs of his Trojan heroes, who hung on the boiler themſelves, and cooked their own dinners on a gridiron? or can we imagine that Homer anticipated in idea the luxury and elegance

gance of two or three centuries after his own age? or when he afterwards deſcribes the golden ewer placed on a ſilver laver, in which he waſhed, the purple carpets and carved bedſteads, on which he lay, can we reaſonably ſuppoſe, that Homer had in his age ſeen ſuch things in idea only? The manifeſtations of luxury and elegance in the Æneid, writ in the moſt elegant age of the world, are nothing in compariſon of thoſe in Homer. Although the Greek orders of architecture might not then be invented, yet the ideas of magnificence conſpicuous in Homer's palaces muſt have been borrowed from the practice of much later ages, than thoſe he deſcribes, from times poliſhed in arts as well as civilized in manners.

More eſpecially will this concluſion ſeem reaſonable, if we conſider Homer's language; for, excepting ſome few words, his language is equal to the Greek of the pureſt times, That moſt curious machine, the formation of the Greek tongue in its ſeveral tenſes, caſes and numbers was all perfect and compleat when Homer wrote; than which there cannot well be a ſurer proof, that the Greeks had long before his time arrived at a ſettled ſtate of civilization; his language is of the golden age, although the manners of his agents are borrowed from an iron one, a clear proof that the latter are only feigned, but the former natural

to the poet and his audience, who heard his poems ſung. It was impoſſible for his language to have arrived at that ſummit of excellence, to which little improvement or addition was made afterwards, unleſs the ſpeakers were alſo arrived near the ſummit of ſocial life and civil government: for it is the real perception of things, wants, conveniencies, and elegancies, which give birth to the reſpective ideas of them in the mind, and theſe to outward expreſſions of them by words combined into ſignificant ſentences; that the vulgar uſe of a fit language to expreſs all the improvements of civilization ſhould precede the actual uſe and attendant effects of civilization is ſuch a paradox, as no man would eaſily fall into, who had not previouſly and raſhly adopted ſome poſition which was inconſiſtent with the real truth. That very circumſtance of his poetic licences ſhews, that Homer had outſtripped in refinement the vulgar dialect of the moſt elegant ſucceeding ages. Moreover, as Homer certainly wrote in the Greek which obtained in Aſia down to the moſt civilized times of the Greek colonies there, he could not therefore write until long after the Ionic migration, if he was a native of an Aſiatic colony (as Mr. Wood juſtly contends): for we cannot ſuppoſe, that the language of thoſe Ionic ſettlers could become any way fixed and pure, until long after the ſettlement of thoſe coloniſts,

coloniſts. Now the Ionic migrations to Aſia are placed at leaſt at one hundred, or one hundred and fifty years after the ſiege of Troy; from the latter of which dates there were about three hundred and fifty more to Pſammetichus, in ſome one of which four laſt centuries Homer muſt have lived. Accordingly we find that he makes mention of Miletus and Micale, which were two of the colonies planted after the Ionic migration, but which he makes exiſting in the time of Troy, under the government of the Carians. Miletus was at ſooneſt built by Codrus (as Strabo ſays) a hundred years after the capture of Troy. It is the more probable, that both it and Mycale were at leaſt names impoſed by the Greeks, (whenever the towns were founded) becauſe there was alſo a Miletus in Crete, mentioned in Homer's Catalogue; and another town and promontory of Mycale in Greece: now that Greeks ſhould new-name ſettlements in Ionia by names in their native country is natural; but that the Aſian nation of Carians ſhould have hit upon two of the very ſame Grecian names long before the Greeks ſettled there, is totally improbable. Homer plainly conſiders the Carians as native Aſians in contradiſtinction to Greeks, which Strabo confirms; and yet Homer has by an anachroniſm given them two towns, not built, or at leaſt not named ſo until at leaſt 100 years after, when the Greeks

had ſettled in Caria; and poſſibly the name of βαρβαροφωνων might be given to the Carians, becauſe they had not even in Homer's time learned to ſpeak good Greek. But at the ſame time this expreſſion proves either that the Greeks muſt have been then ſo long ſettled in Caria, that theſe native Aſians had almoſt laid aſide their native language, and learned to ſpeak bad Greek; or elſe that they ſtill retained the whole of their native barbarous tongue, notwithſtanding the Greeks had been ſo long ſettled among them. Without one or other of theſe ſuppoſitions, the epithet might juſt as well have been given to any other Aſian people, the Phrygians, Meonians, Lycians, or others, which it is not. Again Homer calls Lemnos *a well built city* (ευκτιμενον πολιεθρον), yet he gives the epithet of αγριοφωνων *(of ruſtic ſpeech)* to the Sintiæ its inhabitants. He doubtleſs deſcribed both theſe and the Carians by peculiarities, whereby they were diſtinguiſhed in his own time, and not at the ſiege of Troy. And that theſe two ſtates alone ſhould be thus ſtigmatized is a tacit confeſſion, that all the reſt of the iſlands and cities in the Archipelago ſpoke as good Greek as himſelf in his own age; which therefore could never be, until long after the Ionic migrations and ſettlements there; conſequently ſome time between about the one hundred and fiftieth year after Troy,

and

and the three hundred and fiftieth year after the above date, when Pſammetichus began his reign alone in Egypt, which was about ninety before Solon, and one hundred and ſeventy-eight years before the invaſion of Greece by Xerxes. The earlieſt date is ſufficient to diſprove Mr. Wood's ſuppoſition, that Homer finiſhed his poems within fifty years after the capture of Troy (p. 216); but the nearer we bring down his time to the latter date, the more probable. In fact Euſebius acknowledges, that ſome placed Homer only a little before the beginning of the Olympiads, and ſome not until one hundred years afterwards. Extiterunt alii, qui modico tempore antequam Olympiades inciperent 400 retro annis Trojanæ captivitatis eum fuiſſe putent; licet Archilochus 23 Olympiades et quintum Trojanæ everſionis annum ſupputet. *In Chronico.* Quintum muſt be an error, ariſing from contractions in MSS. for *quingenteſimum*, the five hundredth year after Troy. For twenty-three Olympiads make ninety-two years more than the former date, and as the former date of the four hundred years ended a little before the Olympiads, this latter date will bring down Homer near the end of the five hundredth year after Troy; which was about the commencement of Pſammetichus, and thereby juſtifies the firſt interpretation

of

of βαρβαροφωνων *. Paterculus agrees to the more early computation. Hic longius a temporibus belli, quod compoſuit, troſci, quam quidam arbitrentur, abfuit, nam ferme ante annos 850 floruit, intra M natus eſt. He dates from the conſulſhip of M. Vinicius, in the ſecond year of the two hundred and ſecond Olympiad, which was the eight hundred and ſixth year after the beginning of the Olympiads, therefore he places him at loweſt about forty-five years before it; but his earlieſt date ſtill makes him later not only than the Æolic, but alſo the Ionic migrations into Aſia, and from four to two hundred years after Troy at leaſt; and as a proof of it he adds, that Homer has given to towns, in the time of Troy, names which they did not poſſeſs until long after. Ex perſona poetæ et corinthum et quaſdam Ionum colonias iis nominibus appellat, quibus vocabantur ætate ejus, multo poſt Ilium captum conditæ. Lib. i. He particularly mentions Miletus as being one of theſe Ionian colonies. Homer happily left theſe few ſpecks and offences againſt propriety in the execution of his plan, as a mark to ſhew poſterity that altho' he himſelf lived in a civilized and even elegant

* Petavius ſays, that Theopompus alſo placed Homer five hundred years after Troy, and Soſibius only about twenty years ſooner. *Doct. Temp.* ix. 31.

age,

age, yet having laid the ſcene of his poem in a more antient one, he only feigned a ſimplicity and a roughneſs of manners for his heroes, agreeably to propriety; juſt as Virgil did afterwards. Thoſe therefore who pretend, that Homer copied from real life, and only what he ſaw tranſacted around him, detract as much from Homer's merit, as they contradict truth and hiſtory: for to be able to ſupport obſolete and feigned manners well throughout, muſt be a harder taſk, than to imitate preſent and living ones; and certainly it requires great care not to fall into the abovementioned little improprieties and anachroniſms, which Mr. Wood ought to have attended to in Homer, when (in p. 323) he blames Virgil for committing the ſame, for he ſays, "There are two anachroniſms in one line of Virgil,

Claſſemque ſub ipſo
Antandro, at Phrygiæ molimur montibus Idæ,

"For Antandros was not then built, nor was the region of Troas then called Phrygia." This remark ſeems juſt with reſpect to Phrygia; but I know of no authority he could have, that Antandros was not then built, except probability; at leaſt I find nothing in Strabo to the contrary: but certainly it muſt be the effect of prejudice not to find the like objections againſt Homer, Milton, and probably all epic poets.

I ſhall

I ſhall conclude this examination of his prejudices againſt Homer with conſidering the validity of his objections againſt Pope's tranſlation of Homer.

Thoſe directed (at p. 79) againſt Pope's tranſlation of the ſecond book of the Iliad are foreign to the purpoſe of criticiſm; becauſe Mr Pope previouſly informs his readers to expect ſome additional epithets to the original, in order to render a dry catalogue of names agreeable to an Engliſh reader, by preſenting him rather with "a landſcape or piece of painting as much as poſſible." Mr. Wood quotes ſome of this apology of Pope, but ſtops too ſhort, and ought to have quoted alſo the following words: "This addition of epithets has never been done, without the beſt authority from the antients." The only object therefore of criticiſm is to examine whether Pope has complied with this rule, which he had formed for his own conduct. If he has, he has done his part faithfully; and although theſe additional epithets may not deſcribe the places, as they exiſted in Homer's time (which however we cannot poſſibly know) yet they muſt deſcribe them as they exiſted at ſome time or other in antiquity; and doubtleſs many of theſe epithets will deſcribe qualities and circumſtances not of a tranſitory kind, but which if they exiſted in later times, muſt have exiſted

in

in all former ones. If theſe antient authorities have committed any error, the fault is in them, not in Pope.

Let us advance then along with Mr. Wood, at p. 83, to another objection, which if juſt, would really affect Mr. Pope himſelf, viz. " that Pope has loaded the poet not only with ambiguity, but even with contradiction." His firſt example is " that in ſpite of the ſandy coaſt of Pylos in one place, we have in another

Alpheus' plenteous ſtream, that yields
Encreaſe of harveſt to the Pylian fields.

That Homer and Pope call Pylos ſandy is true, and poſſibly theſe other lines may be taken from Pope's Iliad or Odyſſey, but I confeſs that I have not been able to find them. However there is good authority for them, that of Strabo himſelf, lib. 8. " Super Campum Pyliacum Lucus eſt Cereris egregia fertilitate conſpicuus, qui vero mari adjungitur ſabuloſus et tenuis, ut dubitare ex hoc nemo debeat Emathoentem, id eſt, Sabuloſam appellari Pylum (ſcil. ab. Homero)." Although the coaſt was ſandy, yet we find, that the country above it was fruitful. Where then is the contradiction? His next examples need no illuſtration to free them from contradiction; they may be vindicated by almoſt every part of the ſea-coaſt of England. The inſtance of Hector's running away with

the challenge is indeed a contradiction, yet only between the tranſlator and annotator, who poſſibly copied it from Euſtathius; and Pope might leave it to the reader to determine, which of the two had given the moſt proper ſenſe to the doubtful word ἰων, which neither ſignifies of itſelf walking ſlow, nor running faſt, but poſſibly might equally well imply either.

We come now to Mr. Wood's grand complaint againſt Pope, p. 87, "So capital an error as that of diſcharging the Scamander into the Ægean ſea, inſtead of the Helleſpont, is a ſtriking ſpecimen of the careleſs manner in which this matter has been treated. Yet this miſtake, material as it is, does not ſeem to miſlead the tranſlator in other reſpects: for he is as inconſiſtent with his own incorrect map, as both he and his map are with the real ſituation of the ground. I was at a loſs to account for ſo much obvious inaccuracy, collected into ſo ſmall a compaſs, till I diſcovered a certain regularity of error, which could belong to the engraver alone, and which reverſes the ſituation of all the parts from right to left, ſo that Sigeum ſtands where Rhætium ſhould be, and the Scamander runs on that ſide Troy, which belongs to the Simois."

Now notwithſtanding theſe exaggerated complaints, we ſhall find, that the whole amounts

to

to nothing more, which is clear, except that the words Sigeum and Rhætium are tranſpoſed. A prodigious matter indeed! Cluver has placed the mouth of the Scamander at a greater diſtance from the Helleſpont; Cellarius as far; but Mr. Pope's map has brought it ſo near, that he ought rather to have been commended for correcting both, and Bergler alſo, who in his map prefixed to his edition of Homer, follows the others. Cluver places Troy on the ſouth ſide of both the rivers Simois and Scamander: Bergler and Cellarius on the north ſide. Pope in his general map only follows the error of the two firſt geographers; but in his particular map of the field of battle, he has been the firſt to correct the errors of all the others, by placing Troy right, that is, in the middle between the two rivers. A ſubject again for praiſe, not for ſuch elaborate cenſure. The words Sigeum and Rhætium are however ſtill miſplaced; but as to the remaining article of cenſure, whether the northernmoſt of the two branches of the river before they unite, was called the Scamander, and the ſouthernmoſt Simois, or contrary-wiſe, this is a matter of great doubt notwithſtanding what Mr. Wood ſeems ſo certain of in favour of his own map. Cluver makes the northernmoſt to be the Simois, like Mr. Wood; Cellarius does the ſame; yet it ſeems to have been done by miſtake even in him, becauſe he

alſo calls it Xanthus, which was the name of Scamander. But Bergler makes the northernmoſt the Scamander, Mr. Pope does the ſame in both his general map and particular one. Mr. Wood inverts their ſituation; but Mr. Chandler, who has viewed the country ſince Mr. Wood, nevertheleſs agrees in his map with Pope, and has brought Scamander back to the north again: and Mr. Wood after all the foregoing harſh words does not give us a ſingle antient proof, in defence of his own opinion, either with reſpect to the poſition of the rivers or the promontories Sigeum and Rhætium. However it is plain from Strabo that Rhætium was the northernmoſt promontory, but equally plain, that Scamander was the northernmoſt river. He ſays, lib. 13, "that the Scamander, Granicus, and Æſapus riſe all out of the ſame part of the Idæan mountains, called Colylus, at 120 ſtadii *beyond* Scepſis; the two latter run northward into the Propontis, the former weſtward, ariſing from one fountain." Now Scepſis was at the bottom of the Adramytteus Sinus; *beyond* muſt therefore mean eaſtward into the interior part of the country. In lib. 7. he ſays, that 8 ſtadii make a Roman mile, therefore the ſource of the Scamander was 15 miles farther into the country than Scepſis, to which muſt be added the diſtance thence croſs the Idæan mountains to the Helleſpont,

leſpont, which altogether can never come within the 23 miles which Mr. Wood gives to the whole courſe of the Scamander; it muſt be farther than that from Scepſis alone. This gives a preſumption, that Mr. Wood has miſtaken the Simois for the Scamander, and that this latter was the northermoſt of the two; which we ſhall find other circumſtances in Strabo to confirm. For he adds, that a river called Andrius runs into the Scamander from a certain mountainous diſtrict called Cariſena, which is adjacent to the Dardannic diſtrict, and extends as far as to Zelia and Pitya." Now all theſe places are to the northward of Troy; Dardanus a little to the ſouth of Abydus, therefore the Dardannic region was to the north and eaſt of it. Zelia and Pitya were ſtill farther north near the coaſt of the Propontis; if the river Andrius then roſe out of the mountains to the northward, or to the eaſt of Dardanus, and ran ſouthward into the Scamander, it was ſcarcely poſſible, but the Scamander muſt be to the northward of the Simois, elſe it would have been the Simois, which muſt have received the Andrius; for ſurely the northernmoſt of the two muſt have received it. Mr. Wood mentions no ſuch river now as the Andrius.

Mr. Wood commits another error in ſaying, "That the fountains, whence the Scamander took its riſe, were according to Homer, cloſe by

by the walls of the city." It is indeed true, that Euſtathius, Dacier, and Pope make Homer call theſe *the two ſources* of the Scamander; but Homer really ſays no more than *that two fountains roſe near the city, which ran into the Scamander*; this does not imply, that theſe were the head and ſource of the river.

ενθα δε πηγαι
Δοιαι αναισουσε, Σκαμανδρου δινηεντος. Il. 22.

He does not ſay αἱ πηγαι *the ſources* of the Scamander riſe *there*; but only *two fountains of or belonging to the Scamander riſe there* ενθα πηγαι δοιαι. Pope in his notes pretends, that Strabo underſtood Homer to mean *the ſources*; but this is not true. Strabo only ſhews, that others underſtood Homer in that ſenſe; but as for himſelf, ſince he found only one ſource at the head of the Scamander, and that a cold one, and no hot one, as Homer mentions, therefore he explains Homer as above by adding, frigidæ autem (ſc. aquæ) per derivationem è Scamandro efluentes juxta hunc locum (Trojam) exoriuntur, vel quia *prope* Scamandrum ſunt, hæc aqua etiam Scamandri fons dicitur, nam hoc modo *plures* fontes ejuſdem fluminis dici poſſunt. l. 13.

I have only to add, that the ſenſe Mr. Wood gives to Horace's epithet for the Helleſpont, viz. *inſanientem* (p. 319) as denoting its mad contrariety of currents, ſeems confirmed by a paſ-

ſage

ſage in Pliny, wherein he gives a like name to vines and fig-trees, which bud and produce their fruit in ſucceſſion at three different times of the year, " Vites quidem triferæ ſunt, quas ob id *inſanas* vocant; quoniam in iis alia matureſcunt, alia turgeſcunt, alia florent," Nat. Hiſt. xvii: 27.

There may be ſtill ſome other obſervations in Mr. Wood's tract equally liable to cenſure, among various juſt remarks, which latter if ſelected from the former, and reduced to a narrow compaſs, would not have expoſed him to deſerve a ſimilar reproof to that againſt Ovid's works, that he indulged too much to the ſuggeſtions of his own genius,

REMARKS

REMARKS

CONCERNING

Dr. Henry's Hiſtory of Britain, Bertram's Edition of Ricardus of Cirenceſter, and Horſeley's Antiquities, tending to illuſtrate the State of Scotland under the Romans.

ONE would have wiſhed, and in ſome degree might have expected to have found in Dr. Henry's new Hiſtory of Britain an improved account of the ſtate of Scotland under the Romans: by his reſidence there in the neighbourhood of many Roman ſtations, he might have collected many circumſtances, which former writers on this ſubject had no opportunity to obtain. But ſince inſtead of improvements we find obſervations which rather tend to confuſe, than to illuſtrate thoſe antiquities, I ſhall preſent a few hints for future writers.

Dr. Henry ſays, " that Ptolomy computed his longitude from Alexandria." This

is

is certainly an error; he computed it from the moſt diſtant land in the weſtern ocean; as is manifeſt not only by his longitudes, as ſet down by Dr. Henry, but alſo by the following words of Ptolomey himſelf—Equinoctialem deſcribentes, hujus partium principium ab ejus fine inchoabimus, per quem et occidentaliſſimum deſcribemus meridianum. Geog. i. 22.

He ſays again—"That Ptolomey has committed one general error in placing Scotland too far north by two or three degrees;" he ſhould have rather ſaid ſix or ſeven degrees; for Ptolomey makes the Mull of Galloway to be the northernmoſt part of all Scotland, and places it in 61° 40′; whereas it is ſcarcely in 55° 0′ latitude.

He ſays, p. 503, "The river Itys in Ptolomey is one of the rivers which run into the ſea oppoſite to the Iſle of Sky." He ought to have ſaid, "oppoſite to the Iſle of Mull;" for it is undoubtedly the ſame, as what is ſtill called the river and Loch Etive. Ptolomey's numbers agree to the one almoſt as well as to the other.

The Sinus Lelannonius is called in ſome MSS. Lemannonius, and I think antiquaries are miſtaken in making it the ſame with Loch Fin; it ſhould by the name be rather the bay into which Loch Lomond diſcharges itſelf, and

to which the county of Lennox is adjacent. Ptolomey's numbers agree rather better to this than to the other bay. I propoſe to take notice at this opportunity of erroneous remarks given us by Bertram in his notes to his edition of Ricardus Corinenſis, printed at Hanau, 1757, under the auſpices of Dr. Stukeley, who we may preſume ſupplied the interpretations found there of Roman names in Brittain; and alſo like errors in Whitaker's Hiſtory of Mancheſter. Bertram adopts this error about Loch Fin, and alſo makes its latitude 60° 40′ inſtead of 60° 0′; and Itys he makes 60° 0′ inſtead of 60° 40′.

Dr. Henry ſays, "The river Longus runs up to Inner Lochy." Whitaker agrees with him: they ſeem to be right. Bertram makes it the ſame with a Loch Long, now ſo called, which is in Roſsſhire, on the weſt coaſt northward of the Iſle of Sky: but this diſagrees with Ptolomey's longitude of it, 24° 0′; which is the ſame as he gives to the Sinus Lelannonius; and both of them he places more ſouthward, i.e. according to him to the weſt of Itys fl. which has 27 degrees. This longitude then of Longus fl. beſt agrees to the bay running up to Inner Lochy. It will however agree to the ſituation of a *Loch Loung*, or Long, mentioned by Dr. Macpherſon in his *Critical* Diſſertations on the Caledonians, p. 296, near Dunbarton; but cannot be ſo far north as Loch Long in the

the Clyde. *Loung* means, as the Doctor tells us, a haven or road for ſhips. Query, whether the *Naves Longæ* mentioned in Latin authors may not derive their name hence, and not from the Latin ſenſe of Longus. The Danes and Norwegians ſeem to have made the mouth of Loch Lochy, near the Iſle of Mull, the chief ſtation for their ſhips. Vide Macpherſons's Diſſert.

Dr. Henry ſays, "The bay Volſas is Loch Bay in Roſsſhire." Bertram has more probably made it the ſame as Loch Yoll in Roſsſhire.

The Nabæus fl. of Ptolomey all agree in making the ſame as *Navern*; now it's latitude is 60° 30′, and its longitude 30° 0′. But Tarvedrum, or Orcas has only 60° 15′ lat. and 31° 20′ long. this muſt therefore be the eaſtmoſt point of Ptolomey's Scotland, as having the greateſt longitude of any; it could not therefore be Faro Head, as ſome ſuppoſe; for this would have had a leſs longitude in Ptolomey than Nabæus, and a greater latitude. Bertram has therefore rightly made Orcas to be Dungſby Head; and Whitaker erroneouſly made Dungſby Head the ſame with the Berubium promontory of Ptolomey. Bertram has rightly made Virvedrum promontory to be the Noſs Head, and Berubium to be Ord Head; to the long. and lat. of which in Ptolomey

they anſwer beſt, and near which is Berrydale, which has ſome reſemblance. Whitaker is conſequently again miſtaken in calling *Ripa Alta* the Ord Head; which Bertram more juſtly makes Tarbart Neſs; the Latin name well deſcribes its appearance; the others Ptolomey juſtly calls promontories, but Tarbart Neſs only a *high bank* (ripa alta); it is a low ſhore, which appears a flat country comparatively with the others.

Dr. Henry ſays, p. 106, "The river Loxa is the river Loth in Sutherland;" this cannot be, becauſe Ptolomey gives it a leſs longitude eaſtward (according to his poſition of Scotland as running from weſt to eaſt) than Ripa Alta by 30′; it muſt therefore have been weſtward of Ripa in his map, and to the ſouth of Tarbart Neſs in our maps. Bertram had conjectured, that it was the Firth of Cromartie, and Whitaker follows him; they gueſſed right; but in order to confirm it, they might have added, that the river which runs in at the head of the Firth of Cromartie is ſtill at this day called the *Loſſy*.

Dr. Henry ſays, "The Æſtuary Vara is the Firth of Tayne;" but its longitude is made by Ptolomey one degree leſs eaſtward than that of Loxa, and one degree and a half leſs than Ripa Alta; therefore it muſt have been to the weſt of both in his map, and to the ſouth of both

both in ours. Bertram has rightly then called it the Firth of Inverneſs and Murray; and Whitaker erroneouſly the Firth of Dornock, which is the ſame with the Firth of Tayne. The map of Ric. Corinenſis alſo places *Vara* near Inverneſs; and in his Fragments of Itinera, p. 38, he ſays, ab ultima Ptorotone per medium inſulæ iſca Damnonorum uſque ſic; Varis m. p. 8. ad Tueſſim 18, Tamea 28. Hence it appears that *Varis* could not be far from the Tueſſis, which I ſhall ſhew to be the river Spey. But here occurs a difficulty, which cannot eaſily be removed on the common ſuppoſitions; Ptolomey lays down Ptoroton, as being not only ſomething more north than the Tueſſis, which his poſition of Scotland might indeed make it, but alſo as being more to the eaſt than Tueſſis, which no poſition could poſſibly make Ptoroton, if it had been Inverneſs. Another difficulty is, that Ric. Corinenſis above makes it eight miles from Ptoroton to the Varis, and makes Varis the firſt ſtage on the road from Ptoroton ſouthward. This could again never be if Ptoroton was Inverneſs, and Varis the Firth of Murray, the latter being north to the former. In order to remove theſe difficulties, I apprehend, that Ptoroton could never be Inverneſs. Ptolomey's name is πτερωτον στρατοπεδον, i. e. *alata Caſtra*, by which I ſuppoſe was meant *the camp of the wings*, which were termed

termed *alæ*, and generally compoſed of the light auxiliary horſe. The Chron. Ravenn. gives us a name *Alita-cenon*, which Whitaker with probability makes Elgin; this latter has ſome remains of the former name; and poſſibly it may be the ſame alſo with the Alata-caſtra of Ptolomey, and the Ptoroton of Ricardus. The lat. and long. of the Tueſſis might be fixed by Ptolomey not from the mouth of the Tueſſis (or Spey), but from the place where this road ſouthward *per mediam inſulæ* from Elgin firſt approaches the Tueſſis, which is both weſtward from Elgin, and alſo far to the ſouthward, as Ptolomey accordingly twice fixes it in reſpect of Ptoroton. For the rout would be as follows: From Elgin weſtward to Nairn, where the road comes cloſe to the Æſtuary Vara (the Firth of Inverneſs) 8 miles, thence to the Spey or Tueſſis ſouthward by the rout of the preſent King's road 18. This would reconcile all accounts. Nairn has a traditionary reputation of being a moſt antient town, and this is the beſt way a road could go from Elgin to Avimore, where it firſt approaches the Spey (Tueſſis). Elgin was finely ſituated for the northmoſt ſtation in a plain country where the auxiliary horſe could act, and having a road to it from the ſouth two ways, one along the flat eaſt coaſt, and another through the midſt of the iſland, and conſequently through the Highlands,

lands, the very ſame way that the King's road, called *Wade*'s road, goes: it has ever ſince remained the capital of that coaſt.

Dr. Henry ſays, "The Eſtuary Tua is Cromarty, or elſe Murray Firth.—The river Celnius is the Spey." Not one of theſe aſſertions is right. Bertram more accurately calls the Tua or Tueſſis, the Spey. There can be no doubt of this; it is ſtill called by the very ſame name at this day in the Erſe tongue. The Highlanders know no ſuch name as Spey, but call it *Tu-aiſh*, that is, the *north river*, *Tu* means north, and *Aiſh*, or *Uiſh*, is their vulgar word for river. In the Greek of Ptolomey it is writ *Tuai*, and in ſome MSS. *Tuais*. This being the largeſt river in that part of Scotland, and running almoſt directly north near the mouth, ſufficiently points out the origin of its name, the north river. It is proved alſo by the Iter (the 80th) of Ricardus above, in which we ſaw that at the ſecond ſtage ſouthward, through the middle of the iſland, they croſſed the Tuæſſis. In another Iter (8th) alſo going northward, the road from Aberdeen (Devana) comes firſt to the Ituna, then to the Grampian mountain, then to Selinam, an error for Celniam, then to Tuæſſis, and at laſt to Ptoroton (Elgin). This is the courſe alſo of the preſent road along the eaſt coaſt, which in this caſe croſſes the Tuæſſis near the mouth

at

at Gordon Caſtle, the very road which the Duke of Cumberland marched with his army. Ptolomey calls the inner part of the Murray Firth near Inverneſs and Nairn the *Vara* Æſtuary; and the more outward part at the mouth of the Spey the *Tuai* Æſtuary, the latter ſeparated from the former by a headland advancing a little into the ſea.

It only remains to determine the Celnius, which therefore is not the Spey, but as all other authors have agreed the Dovern or Devron. There is a memorial of it ſtill remaining at a bridge at no great diſtance from where the road from Aberdeen croſſes it; which is a ſtage known to all paſſengers there, and is at this day commonly called the Bridge of *Keln*; but I am not certain, whether the water of this rivulet runs into the Dovern or into the Ythan; the two heads of which approach near to each other. In like manner, though the town of Lindum is now unknown, yet we ſhall find afterwards, that the Bridge of Lind is ſtill remaining. A town called Cullin ſtands near the mouth, which bears ſome remains of *Celniam*. I think alſo there is ſome tradition in the country of the antiquity of Cullin.

I believe no author except Ricardus mentions the Ituna, which without doubt is the Ython, or Ithan. The names are manifeſtly alike. There is an Ython ſomewhere in Wales, or the weſt

weſt of England, which is alſo in Latin called Ituna.

There are two other towns mentioned by Ptolomey, which Dr. Henry does not attempt to fix, viz. Banatia and Tameia; theſe two together with Alata Caſtra and Tuæſſis Ptolomey deſcribes as being in the country of the Vacomagi; Sub Caledoniis ſunt Vacomagi; apud quos hæ ſunt urbes Banatia, Tameia, Alata Caſtra, Tuæſſis. Sub iis, quæ magis occidentales ſunt, habitant Vennicones; in quibus urbs Orrea. By *ſub* and *poſt* the antients meant *ſouthward*; becauſe the north pole is above the horizon, and becauſe the geographers always turned their face to the ſouthward, ſo that the weſt was always on their right hand, hence an omen from the weſt was called *ad dextram*; therefore the ſouthern cities were *behind* (poſt) thoſe to the north of them in their poſition for viewing them. Now Ptolomey ſhews, that the Caledonians inhabited what we call the weſt coaſt of Scotland, or the weſt ſide of Loch Neſs; the Vacomagi therefore inhabited the eaſt ſide of Loch Neſs; for this ſituation was *ſub* or to the ſouth of the former in Ptolomey's poſition of Scotland; the Vacomagi then were the inhabitants of the Highland diſtrict called now Badenoch and Athol, which includes the whole range of the Grampian mountains running from eaſt to weſt. By Marcelli-

nus they are called Vecturiones; a ridge of theſe mountains for above twenty miles is ſtill called *Uachtur*, and its inhabitants *Uachturich*, which means Highlanders, and is the original of both thoſe Latin names. Here then we muſt look for theſe four towns: Alata Caſtra, Tuæſſis, and Banatia lay on the north ſide of this Grampian ridge of mountains, and Tameia near the ſouth ſide. The tenth Iter of Ricardus comes from Ptoroton firſt to Varis 8 miles, to Tuæſſis 18, to Tameia 28, thence to Orrea near Perth. By this rout it is plain that Tameia muſt be a town at the paſſage croſs the Tay, or Taus; there is ſtill a town there called Taymouth; this is the way the King's road of Wade now goes, and no other road could avoid paſſing the Tay near the ſame place. Banatia was probably ſome intermediate town in Badenoch between Tameia and Tueſſis, and from Badenoch took its name; of which place Ricardus takes no notice, and it might poſſibly not lie in the direct road ſouthward. There is a tradition in the country of an antient town placed near the head of the Spey, and where the preſent King's Road croſſes it in the way to Corryarrich and Fort Auguſtus; this is in Badenoch, and anſwers tolerably well to the lat. and long. of Ptolomey, who places it a conſiderable way to the weſtward of the town Tueſſis, where the road croſſes the Spey near Avimore, which it

really

really would be; and ſomething to the north of it, which perhaps it would not be.

Concerning Alauna, Dr. Henry ſays, p. 509, "That Horſeley contends it was ſituated near Falkirk, upon the Roman wall at a place called Camelon." Horſeley muſt be wrong here; for Ric. Corinenſis in his ninth Iter from Lugu-ballia to Ptoroton, after bringing the road as far as *Ad Vallum*, adds, incipit Veſpaſiana, Alauna m. p. 12. Thus it appears Alauna was 12 miles north of the Roman wall near Falkirk; therefore near Stirling, and without doubt near the river Alaunus, ſtill called Allan, as alſo the valley through which it runs is ſtill called Strath Allan; which river joins the Forth a little above Stirling: but whether Alauna was the ſame as Stirling, or ſituated on the north ſide of the Forth is a matter of doubt.

"Lindum (ſays Dr. Henry) both in ſound and ſignification of its name bears ſo great a reſemblance to Linlithgow, that it is moſt probable the ſame place, though its ſituation doth not agree exactly with that aſſigned by Ptolomey, who is far from being correct in that particular." Dr. Henry is more miſtaken in this article than Horſeley in the preceding one. For Lindum was certainly to the northward of Alauna, and not as Linlithgow to the ſouthward of it. The latitudes indeed in Ptolomey's poſition would be the ſame in both caſes.

But Ricardus Corinenſis ſays, p. 35, that he collected his Itinera partly, ex fragmentis quibuſdam a duce quodam Romano conſignatis et poſteritati relictis, and partly from Ptolomey and others. In his 9th Iter a Luguballio Ptorotonim uſque, his Stations are as follow: incipit Veſpaſiana; Alauna 13; Lindo 9; Victoria 9; ad Hiernam 9; Orrea 14; ad Tavum 18; ad Æſicam 23, &c. Hence it appears, that Lindum was nine miles to the north of Alauna: accordingly we ſtill find the name ſubſiſting in that country at the diſtance here mentioned; for about nine miles from Stirling the road croſſes the Allan upon a bridge ſtill called the Bridge of Lind, juſt before it enters Dumblain; Lindum was therefore either the ſame as Dumblain, or very near it. About nine miles north of Dumblain is Airdoch, at which there ſtill remains the moſt perfect Roman camp in all Britain: The King's Road made by General Wade from Dumblain to Airdoch, runs often upon the remains of a Roman road ſtill viſible. I apprehend then that the ſtation at Airdoch was the ſame as Victoria, as Baxter contends; it probably had not its name for nothing; and its ſituation agrees very well to the account which Tacitus gives of the firſt victory obtained over the Caledonians on the north of Bodotria: his words are, diviſo et ipſe in tres partes exercitu inceſſit: quod ubi cogni tum

cognitum Hoſti, univerſi nonam Legionem nocte aggreſſi cæſis vigiliis irrupere, &c. fuit atrox in ipſis portarum anguſtiis prælium, donec pulſi hoſtes, quod niſi paludes et ſilvæ fugientes texiſſent, debellatum illa *victoria* foret. Ric. Corinenſis confirms this, he ſays, p. 30, Re non minus quam nomine reliquis gloriofior, Victoria, ab Agricola ad flumen Tavum 20 milliaria ab ejuſdem in mare exitu ædificata, memoriæ proditum dicunt. He is however miſtaken in placing Victoria upon the Tay; and his own account abovementioned ſhews, that it was nine miles ſouthward of the river Ern; therefore at Airdoch, which is about that diſtance from the river Ern (*Hiernam*). This Roman road croſſed the Ern at Crief; where there are ſtill the remains of another Roman camp, or rather fort only, being much ſmaller than the other at Airdoch, which latter was certainly not a haſty temporary camp, but a fixed ſtation, it being encompaſſed with ſeveral valli. At Crief the Roman roads divided on the north ſide of the Ern; the remains of one are ſtill viſible running eaſtward by Inner Peffry to the river Tay at Perth; the other alſo viſible in many places going northward near the eaſt end of Loch Tay, and ſo through the middle of the Highlands and iſland to Ptoroton or Elgin, as mentioned above. One of the King's roads by Wade goes the very ſame way,

and

and often upon the remains of the Roman road toward Dalnacardoch. Orrea was ſituated near Perth in all probability, but it is thought upon the eaſt ſide of the Tay; therefore the fourteen miles reckoned above by Ric. Cor. from the Hierna to Orrea are to be reckoned from Crief or Inner Peffry. He ſeems to confirm that Orrea was on the eaſt of the Tay; ultra Tavum erant Venricones, quorum urbs primaria Orreafluvii vero Æſica et Tina, poſſibly it was *Scoon* or near it, the antient reſidence of the Scottiſh kings.

Hence we perceive another error in Dr. Henry, "The river Finna (he ſays) is the Eden in Fife." Finna muſt be an error in the preſs; the Word in Ptolomey is Tinna; which Ric. Corinenſis places along with the Æſica ultra Tavum, therefore in Angus not in Fife: Æſica is plainly one of the rivers in Angus now called the two Eſks; but query whether North Eſk or South Eſk. Ric. Corinenſis clears up this; for his 9th Iter quoted above going northward comes firſt ad Tavum; viz. to the mouth of the Tay, then ad Æſicam 23, ad Tinam 8, Devana 23. Hereby it appears that the Tina muſt be North Eſk, which might in fact be about eight miles diſtant from where the South Eſk was croſſed by the Road. However it is poſſible, that Ric. Corinenſis may have made miſtakes; but there ought to be ſome better evidence

evidence againſt his authority, than the mere diſtant ſimilitude of the words *Tinna* and *Edin*.

It appears then from the foregoing remarks, that none of the names mentioned in Ptolomey have been found to denote the Firth of Dornoch: But Ric. Corinenſis gives us a name, which ſuits with this Æſtuary, and with no other. Both in his map and words he places *Abona Fluvius* to the northward of *Loxa Fluv.* the Firth of Cromartie. Huic (ſc. Loxæ) ordine proximus eſt Fluvius Abona, p. 32. This river is mentioned by no other author; and the following circumſtances give reaſon to think it the ſame as the Firth of Dornoch. At the head of this Firth two rivers meet and empty themſelves into it; the moſt northern comes from Loch Shin, and at its mouth ſtands a town called *Inverſhin*. At the mouth of the more ſouthern river ſtands another town called *Inveran*, and pronounced *Inver-awn*. Now *Inver*, or *Inner*, is the common word to ſignify a place ſituate at the mouth of a river; as *Inverneſs*, the town at the mouth of the river *Neſs*: *Inver-ſhin* the town at the mouth of the river *Shin*; therefore *Inver-awn* ought to mean alſo the town at the mouth of the *Awn*; which is a corruption of *Avon*, a common name of a river. Accordingly the head of this river is actually even in the maps called *Avon*; and perhaps it may be true, that the lower part of it has the ſame

appel-

appellation. Now *Abona* is a natural corruption of *Avon*; for the *b* and *v* are continually converted into each other in Roman names of Britiſh places, as Nabæus and Cor-nabii from *Navern*, Boadicia and Voadicia, &c. nay even in the pronunciation of Erſe by Highlanders at preſent, there is ſuch an ambiguity in their ſounds to an Engliſh ear, that it is difficult to diſtinguiſh whether they pronounce a *b* or *v*, as in the word *Ben*, a hill, which ſeems pronounced by ſome as if it were *Ven*.

I have only to add, that the ſpot where the antiquaries place the famous battle with Galgacus, viz. in Strathern, near Comrie, (where indeed there is a camp ſtill viſible) does no way ſuit with the deſcription of Tacitus, nor with propriety of conduct. For to the northward are ſome of the moſt impaſſible Grampian mountains in all Scotland; ſo that there was no occaſion for the Caledonii to venture a battle, where the country of itſelf would have forced Agricola to return. Now the ſame ridge of Grampian mountains run eaſtward, and terminate near Stonehaven by a gentle ſlope towards the ſea. Here near the coaſt was the beſt place for Agricola to paſs northward; and this anſwers to the deſcription Tacitus gives of the Britiſh army, of which primum agmen æquo, ceteri per acclive jugum inſurgerent: and remains of ſeveral Roman Camps are ſtill viſible

ble in the neighbourhood: moreover Tacitus expreſsly ſays, that in the expeditions this year the fleet and land army kept ſo near, that the ſoldiers and ſailors often lodged in the ſame places; the land army therefore muſt have marched along the coaſt. Amplas civitates trans Bodotriam ſitas prius claſſe exploravit; quæ ab Agricola primum aſſumpta in partem virium ſequebatur egregia ſpecie, cum ſimul terra ſimul mari bellum impelleretur, ac ſæpe iiſdem caſtris pedes equeſque et nauticus miles mixti copiis et lætitia ſuos caſus attollerent, &c. *Vit. Agric.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

In page 31, *for* αναλυχεν *read* αναλυχειν.
42, the marks † and * are tranſpoſed.
64, line 27, *for* Trojan heroes *read* heroes at Troy.
70, M. Vinitius, l. 6.
72, line 2, *for* Homer *read* Virgil.
74, line 3, *dele* it.
87, line 24, *dele* alſo.

Reſearches concerning the Principles

OF

ANTIENT CHRONOLOGY,

With a view to the illuſtration of various paſſages in the Jewiſh Sacred Scriptures by means of a better connexion between Jewiſh and Prophane Hiſt

Containing more particularly

A detection of errors in Uſher, Prideaux, and Dr. Blair's Chronologic Tables; whereby it will be proved, that when a ſyſtem of Prophane Chronology ſhall be formed entirely in conformity to the dates of antient events ſtill extant in Prophane Authors, without being corrupted by the ſyſtematic errors of Antient Chriſtian Chronologers, or the ill-founded conjectures of Modern Commentators, there will be found ſuch a perfect harmony between Jewiſh and Prophane Chronology, as will not only add a conſiderable proof of veracity to the hiſtoric and prophetic books of the Old Teſtament, but alſo tend to explain and aſcertain the ſenſe of various paſſages, which are at preſent involved in doubt at leaſt, if not in contradiction.

Origin and Object of these Researches.

NO regular and connected history of prophane events having been transmitted down to modern ages in regard to those times, with which Jewish history is principally concerned, several learned authors, such as Scaliger, Calvisius, Petavius, Usher, Vignoles, Prideaux, and Jackson have endeavoured to collect and put together in right chronologic order such scattered historic remains of the times in question, as have by good fortune been preserved, in which they have often all improved upon each other. Dr. Blair in his Tables of Chronology has adopted the best of those systems, which preceding writers had produced; and probably he himself, as well as the public in general, may have thought, that the subject was not capable of farther improvement; but notwithstanding the reputation which those several writers have justly acquired by correcting in their turns many errors of their predecessors; yet I fear it will be found, that the best of them have still left several errors subsisting, which produce many incoherencies with the Jewish scriptures, and consequently raise many doubts in the minds of accurate readers. Hence in fact some of the friends of those original memorials of the antiquities of mankind have been inclined to

suspect,

ſuſpect, and ſome of their enemies actually to affirm, that the whole chronology of thoſe ages, both Jewiſh and prophane, is no better than an inexplicable piece of confuſion, notwithſtanding all the learned labours hitherto beſtowed upon it *. That ſuch an accuſation is not totally deſtitute of foundation, will certainly appear even from a tranſient view of a few of the diſagreements of the beſt chronologers with each other, and at the ſame time with the Jewiſh ſcriptures; yet ſtill a doubt preſents itſelf, whether this apparent confuſion and even contradiction have not ariſen from thoſe very labours themſelves, both in number and abſtruſeneſs, which were intended to remove ſuch objections, rather than from any real confuſion in the ſubject itſelf; for when many errors have been made by

* Moſt certain it is, that the hiſtory and chronology of the ages, that follow (the beginning of the æra of Olympiads) are as confuſed and uncertain as thoſe which immediately precede this æra. I have ſomewhere read, perhaps in the works of St. Jerome, that this father juſtifies the opinion of thoſe who think it impoſſible to fix any certain chronology on that of the Bible: we are indeed more correct and come nearer to the truth (than the Jews) becauſe we make uſe of prophane chronology to help us: but this itſelf is ſo modern, ſo broken, and ſo precarious, that its help does not reach to the greateſt part of that time to which ſacred chronology extends, ſo that when it begins to help it begins to perplex us too, *Bolingbroke Let.* III. *on Study of Hiſtory.*

preceding writers of reputation, it requires many words and much intricacy of reaſoning to detect and remove them; and unleſs ſuch errors be diſplayed in a ſatisfactory manner, the authority of great names, when of a different opinion, lies heavy upon the recommendation of truth itſelf, if thus more new, than eſtabliſhed error. Now it was ſuch a doubt as this which firſt gave origin to theſe reſearches, the diſcovery of ſome few truths inclined me to the purſuit of more; and as one truth naturally brings to light ſeveral others, the uſeful tendency of the whole toward illuſtrating the ſacred ſcriptures induced me to make them all public, more eſpecially as this is a method of illuſtration in which modern literature ſeems to be deficient. We have ſeen almoſt every other method applied which human genius could ſuggeſt; by ſome learned men conſiderable aſſiſtance has been derived from a more critical knowledge of the Hebrew language; by others, from a compariſon of antient tranſlations with the original Hebrew, and with each other; by ſome, great light has been thrown on phraſes from the ſenſe of words in other oriental and ſtill living languages; by others, antient manners have been inveſtigated from the remains of them ſtill preſerved in eaſtern countries; by ſome, the moſt diſtant regions have been explored,

plored, in order to know from inſpection thoſe natural productions themſelves, of which in ſcripture we only knew the names before; and another great undertaking now almoſt compleat, will ſoon point out what erroneous readings can be removed, which have ariſen from the negligence of ten centuries; but how many more errors of more antient date may be ſtill left ſubſiſting, of which no traces can ever be diſcovered! This circumſtance ought at leaſt to induce us to omit no means within our power to underſtand rightly ſuch paſſages as remain exempt from error in words, but on which nevertheleſs an error in ſenſe may have been fixed by the ill-founded conjectures of expoſitors; and the right order of prophane events will often aſſiſt in aſcertaining this right ſenſe, by determining the real hiſtoric action, to which the words allude. Errors in chronology therefore are not merely ſpeculative errors, but very materially affect the meaning of whole ſentences; nay, ſometimes have had the effect to condemn a whole book of the Jewiſh canon, as being not authentic. Accordingly ſeveral learned men have rejected the book of Judith, and doubted concerning that of Tobit, principally on account of erroneous dates, which commentators have pretended to diſcover in them; while St. Jerom on the contrary, in order

der that he might retain the book of Judith, has rejected and altered the dates: but if it ſhould appear from the reſult of theſe reſearches, that in caſe the dates of the beſt hiſtorians be rightly put together below in later times, an unſought-for and unexpected conſequence will ariſe, namely, that ſuch coincidences will be produced higher up in more early ages, as will prove the dates in both the abovementioned books to be perfectly conſiſtent with prophane chronology; hereby that very circumſtance, which is now made the chief proof againſt their authenticity, will turn out to be a ſolid proof in their favor. In many other places through the ſceptical miſrepreſentations of ſome, and the ill-founded criticiſms of others, the Holy Scriptures have been condemned for errors not their own; many perſons have been ready to extend to the chronology of the whole, this pretence concerning errors of date in particular places; and ſeveral have been as ready to join with Bolingbroke in paſſing condemnation upon the veracity of the ſcripture hiſtory, on account of ſuch pretended errors in its chronology: in no caſe perhaps has been the poets obſervation *creſcit eundo* more truly verified; therefore in no caſe can it be more ſatisfactory, to find ſolid reaſons to ſtop this progreſs in the very outſet, and firſt

premiſes.

premiſes. But even if ſceptics and infidels did not draw ſuch unwarrantable conſequences from the preſent diſcordant ſtate of chronology; yet when the dates of events, fixed by indubitable principles of aſtronomy as well as by other ſufficient proofs, are moved ſometimes upward, and ſometimes downward, at the mere will and pleaſure of every commentator, in order to ſuit his own fanciful interpretation of prophecies of dubious ſenſes; then friends themſelves to the Jewiſh ſcriptures cannot but take offence at ſuch miſplaced zeal, as tends to injure the cauſe of truth and religion, which it was meant to ſerve; and even the moſt candid readers will then be apt to remember the objection of Cenſorinus, that ſuch diſagreements become a proof of ſome degree of uncertainty †, when perhaps originally there was no room for any doubt whatever. To remove then all objections of this kind, raiſed by a few miſtakes, which have dropped inconſiderately from the pens of ſuch approved authors, as Petavius, Uſher, Prideaux and others, can neither be in itſelf an incurious ſubject, and will even become highly uſeful, if it ſhall tend to explain and reconcile any paſſages of ſcripture, now involved in doubt and diſputation: neither can

† Ipſa Diſſentio incertitudinem declarat.

it

it be any way injurious to the memory of thoſe learned writers, but will rather juſtify the ſolidity of the chief part of their chronology, by clearing away all difficulties concerning ſome particular parts, which they had worked up in a leſs judicious manner than the reſt, while they were intent upon correcting the errors of their predeceſſors; and which although amounting only to a few years, will yet be found attended with more important conſequences, than might have been expected, by deranging the order of events in other places, and by giving riſe to monſtrous ſuppoſitions, in order to reconcile them with prophane hiſtory. Neither is it to the ſcripture chronology of theſe authors that ſuch defects are ſo much to be imputed, as to their prophane chronology of the times connected with the former; and it is by correction of the latter, that the former is chiefly to be corrected likewiſe: for until ſome more fixed and indubitable ſtandard of prophane chronology ſhall be eſtabliſhed, it is impoſſible to judge how far the dates in ſcripture do or do not accord to truth; but when ſuch an accurate rule ſhall be formed, we ſhall then be capable to form a trial of the accuracy of the dates found in the Jewiſh ſcriptures. How then can any reader of theſe ſcriptures act at preſent? Shall a German place implicit confi-

dence

dence in the ſyſtem of prophane chronology formed by Calviſius? A Frenchman in that of Petavius, an Engliſhman in Uſher and Prideaux; and every one in ſuch as has been compiled by ſome eminent native of his own country? Or if theſe be all found to diſagree, muſt each reader be obliged to ſtudy the voluminous and abſtruſe chronologic works of each compiler, in order to form a judgment, to which of them he ought to give the preference? Neither perhaps will ſuch a tedious taſk be ever attended with the deſired ſucceſs; for readers will be too often miſled by the plauſible arguments, which each writer produces in confirmation of his own ſyſtem; but if they ſhould even diſcover the fallacy of thoſe proofs, they will be nothing better enabled to correct them; for any error in one place is commonly communicated to many others both above and below; ſo that nothing but a very comprehenſive view of the whole chain from firſt to laſt, will be ſufficient to diſcover where the error began, and conſequently how it may be intirely removed, and not merely ſhifted to ſome other place. Hence moſt perſons finiſh their laborious ſtudies on this ſubject with the diſſatisfaction of finding almoſt equal difficulties in every ſyſtem hitherto preſented, and almoſt equally good demonſtrations in favor of each;

they join in therefore with Bolingbroke in concluding, that prophane chronology itſelf is *ſo broken, ſo precarious, that when it begins to help, it begins to perplex us too*, inſtead of enabling us with accuracy to try and aſcertain the chronology of ſcripture. In this ſituation of things a diligent reader of the holy ſcriptures will doubtleſs *be glad to find ſome guide, who has trod this whole mazy and perplexed path already*; in the courſe of which he diſcovered ſome truths, which either had not occurred to any enquirers before, or had been as ſoon neglected as perceived, without being turned to any profit; and yet a proper application of theſe will remove the diſcordancies introduced by others, and prove, that no chronologer has been without his errors, that ſometimes one is right, and ſometimes another, and ſometimes not any one.

Such then being the preſent ſtate of chronology both Jewiſh and prophane; ſuch being the ill effects and unfavourable concluſions derived from its diſcordancies, as well as the good effects, which may be expected from reconciling and removing them; ſome perſons may nevertheleſs be inclined to doubt, whether it be poſſible, after ſo many learned folios on this ſubject to diſcover any thing new; and others to queſtion, how it could be poſſible for ſo many learned writers to have overlooked

looked any obvious truths, and disagreed so much with each other, unless there were some inveterate errors in the very principles of the science itself, which no human attention and accuracy could remove. To the former it is sufficient to observe, that it is no uncommon thing for men, even learned men, blindly to follow each other; so that any error once made, and often recognized for truth, becomes sanctified by authority, and will seldom fail to find some friends ready to distort many quotations from antient authors in its defence: moreover, the abstruse disquisitions, which Scaliger, Petavius, and others introduced into chronology, by adding astronomical proofs to historical, have been another cause of concealing their errors from the public, and obstructing improvements in the science; for such learned enquiries have made some suppose, there could be no errors intermixed, and prevented others from examining, whether there were or not; many have been silenced by great names; and the greater part of readers have supposed, that chronology was buried under difficulties by mountains piled upon mountains. In regard to the second question, although Bolingbroke and most others perhaps seem inclined to think, that there are such defects in the very principles of the science, as render it

impoſſible to be brought to perfection, on account of our not having ſufficiently clear and accurate information concerning dates and events tranſmitted down to us by the antients; yet theſe reſearches will rather tend to ſhew, that the fault is in ourſelves and not in the antients; that modern chronologers have not put together the dates, which have been tranſmitted, in a conſiſtent manner; that they have miſtaken the ſenſe of ſeveral paſſages in Greek and Roman authors, as well as in the Jewiſh ſcriptures, and reaſoned inconcluſively from others; that they have built their ſeveral ſyſtems too often upon mere conjecture, and defended favourite ſuppoſitions with more ingenuity than fidelity; that they have ſometimes diſplayed an over-officious zeal for ſuppoſed ſenſes in ſcripture in oppoſition to the plain meaning of prophane authors; and at other times have adhered to the ſyſtematic errors of the antient Jewiſh and Chriſtian chronologers, Joſephus, Africanus, Euſebius, and Syncellus; although theſe writers neither agree with prophane authors, with one another, with ſcripture, nor even with themſelves; upon the whole, that the cenſures paſſed by chronologers upon antient prophane hiſtorians, together with thoſe of ſceptics againſt the Jewiſh ſcriptures, will be found in both caſes always founded in ſome error of

their

their own, either in point of reaſoning or of fact, or of the ſenſe, to which they have tied down the words of an antient quotation, which is juſt as well capable of ſome other and more conſiſtent meaning. Had it not been for theſe impediments, the aſſiſtance which, as Bolingbroke obſerved, ſcripture chronology has already received from prophane, might have been carried much farther than it has. Squire in his defence of the Greek chronology againſt Sir Iſaac Newton has juſtly concluded, that although there might be errors in it, yet they did not amount to any ſuch as Sir Iſaac pretended before the commencement of the Olympiads; but theſe reſearches will carry on the ſame argument ſtill farther, by proving, that the antients have left us ſufficient materials to adjuſt all the principal events without any error of more than a ſingle year, and perhaps not even of that, after the commencement of the three celebrated æras, that of the Olympiads, the foundation of Rome, and the Chaldean æra, called the æra of Nabonaſſar, and commonly but improperly known by the name of Ptolemy's Canon; which three æras commence within 30 years of each other, and include the moſt intereſting period of the Jewiſh hiſtory; ſo that if this enquiry ſhould appear at any time to be chiefly a vindication of prophane chronology, yet it will at the ſame time become

become a vindication of the Jewiſh likewiſe; for when an accurate ſtandard of the former ſhall be thus eſtabliſhed, the latter will be found to agree with it. It was for my own private ſatisfaction entirely, that I firſt attempted to inveſtigate the principles and foundation, on which the ſeveral ſyſtems of chronology are built, in order to diſcover, whether amidſt their diſagreements and altercations, it might not be poſſible to pick out the real truth, ſufficient to convince thoſe, who had no preconceived bias to any ſide; and I had the pleaſure to find, that by purſuing the path I took, order would ariſe out of irregularity and harmony on all ſides inſtead of diſcordancy, than which nothing can be a ſtronger proof of having arrived at truth. If I have committed any errors in my own turn, yet certainly they are not wilful ones, and I ſhall be glad to have them pointed out; men may long embrace falſhood, but with the ingenuous, it is only becauſe they could not ſooner diſcover truth; if I have not actually attained to it, I have at leaſt had no other view than to find it out.

The expediency of ſelecting the invaſion of Greece by Xerxes as the foundation date for our enquiries, and of reckoning backward from that up to the commencement of the three memorable æras under conſideration.

THESE enquiries naturally divide themſelves into two parts; in the firſt of which I propoſe to ſelect ſome memorable event, the date of which has been well aſcertained by antient authors, and agreed upon by modern chronologers, in order to reckon backward from this through the ſeveral kingdoms of Perſia, Media, Lydia, Egypt, Aſſyria, Babylon, and Judea up to the earlieſt times in the Old Teſtament, wherein any mention is made of the Aſſyrian empire, or of any particular King of Egypt. The ſecond part of our enquiry will relate to the foundation date itſelf, and include not only an examination, whether it has been rightly fixed by modern chronologers, in the æra of Olympiads, and connected with other æras and the right year before the vulgar æra of Chriſt; but alſo an enquiry concerning the dates of ſeveral other memorable events in later times, which have been the ſubject of doubt, and in regard to which the words of antient authors have been miſtaken, or the juſtneſs of their dates called in queſtion without ſufficient reaſon.

The

The advantage of thus making all the dates of the moſt antient kingdoms branch out from one root and foundation date ſelected in the civilized age of Greece, and well aſcertained both by antients and moderns, is, that hereby we proceed ſtep by ſtep from what is known to what is more unknown; and no error committed in the doubtful ages of antiquity, can be brought downward to produce any error below. Moreover, even if there ſhould be any reaſon to queſtion, whether the foundation date itſelf has been juſtly fixed by modern chronologers, yet it can produce no alteration of any moment in our concluſions; becauſe any ſuch error will in our method affect all ſuperior dates alike; becauſe they will all depend upon and be branched out from this ſingle foundation date itſelf; their mutual relations and connexions therefore will nevertheleſs ſtill remain invariably the ſame; and the only alteration will be, that they ought all in common to be moved a little farther from or nearer to the vulgar æra of Chriſt.

Now the invaſion of Greece by Xerxes King of Perſia ſeems to be the moſt proper event in Grecian hiſtory, which can be ſelected for our purpoſe; becauſe it was later than the moſt memorable events mentioned in the Jewiſh ſacred ſcriptures; becauſe alſo it happened in an enlightened age, and has moreover been

tranſmitted

tranſmitted to us in the relations of ſeveral antient writers, and thoſe ſome of the moſt celebrated hiſtorians; and ſtill more particularly, becauſe it was the earlieſt event of Aſiatic hiſtory, which we have reaſon to think fixed with certainty in the Grecian records and æra of Olympiads. All preceding events in Aſia, ſuch as the actions of the Aſſyrian, Babylonian, Median, Lydian, and Perſian Kings could be known to the Greeks of Europe only by their own hiſtorians; who had collected their accounts from the doubtful reports of foreigners, either from the Greek ſtates ſettled in Aſia, or from Egypt or Phenicia: theſe Greek hiſtorians had no foreign hiſtories from which they could copy, and they had no admiſſion to any of the archives in Aſia: even during the later and more enlightened times of Greece, we ſhall find the Greek hiſtorians ſtrangely ignorant and contemptuouſly negligent about the dates of Aſiatic events; much more then muſt we expect to find the ſame previouſly to the birth of hiſtory among the Greeks themſelves, which was not until after the invaſion of Xerxes. But the invaſions of Greece, firſt by Darius and afterwards by Xerxes were known to the Greeks by their own ſenſible experience, not by vague reports from others; and theſe events were of too memorable and affecting a nature not to

be recorded with accuracy in their own annals. We may therefore juſtly ſay, that all Aſiatic events before theſe have been accommodated to Olympic dates by later Greek hiſtorians and chronologers upon doubtful authorities, and only by their own computations backwards from theſe two well known events: accordingly we ſhall in fact find, that different antient authors have reckoned backwards in a different manner, and hereby fixed ſome of the moſt memorable Aſiatic events to different Olympic dates; even in regard to the two principal of them, which had alſo an immediate connexion with the affairs of the Aſiatic Greeks, namely, the conqueſt of Media by Cyrus, and his ſubſequent conqueſt of Cræſus and the Lydian empire, we ſhall find ſuch contradiction in the Olympic dates of theſe events, as plainly proves them to have been fixed in the Greek annals no otherwiſe, than by each antient author (who mentions them) computing backward in the beſt manner he could from the age of Xerxes: and our beſt modern ſyſtems of chronology, Dr. Blair's and others, have unfortunately not followed thoſe antient hiſtorians with reſpect to theſe events, to whom the greateſt credit is due; but ſuch as had been miſled, like many moderns, to conſider the

romance

romance of Xenophon, as containing both true hiſtory and true chronology. We hence ſee how neceſſary it is, to ſettle the prophane chronology of Aſiatic kingdoms in a more certain manner, before any one can poſſibly judge, whether ſcripture chronology agrees with it, and which of the two at preſent requires moſt amendment.

Now the date of the invaſion of Greece by Xerxes in the æra of Olympiads, as unanimouſly given us by antient authors of credit, is the 1ſt year of the 75th Olympiad: by which, on comparing the relation of Herodotus, we find they only meant, that the moſt memorable events of this invaſion fell within the 1ſt year of that Olympiad, viz. the battle of Thermopylæ, the capture of Athens, and the ſucceeding naval victory over the Perſians at Salamis; for all theſe happened after the ſummer ſolſtice, at which time each Olympic year always commenced: but with reſpect to the paſſage of the Helleſpont by Xerxes, this was effected early in the preceding ſpring, in the ſame Julian year indeed before Chriſt (for each Julian year always commenced in January) therefore not in the ſame Olympic year, but in the concluſion of the 4th year of the 74th Olympiad. In like manner in all other caſes we muſt remember, that each

Olympic year co-numerary with any Julian year before Chriſt or year of Rome, does not begin until the Midſummer in the middle of that Julian year, conſequently ſix months later than the commencement of the co-numerary year of Rome, as well as the co-numerary year before Chriſt. It is for this reaſon, that I uſe the word co-numerary, and not co-temporary; ſince it is evident, that only ſix months of any Julian year or year of Rome can be really co-temporary with any ſingle Olympic year; but whatever Julian year or year of Rome is diſtant the *ſame number* of years from any given event as any given Olympic year, theſe become all co-numerary with each other, and any one of them an index to the other, but only in part co-temporary. Although all chronologers and almoſt all readers know this, yet through want of preciſion they have often miſled others as well as themſelves by an abuſe of this word co-temporary. For inſtance, Greek authors relate, that Alexander paſſed the Helleſpont into Aſia in the Olympic year, wherein Exænetus was Archon at Athens; but Diodorus has placed this event under his ſucceſſor Cteſicles, therefore Diodorus (ſome chronologers ſay) has committed an error of one year. No, the error is in the reaſoner, not in that antient hiſtorian; for he digeſts his work according

to

to Roman years and conſulſhips; now Alexander paſſed over in the ſpring, and the Archonſhip of Exænetus did not end until the following Midſummer, at which Cteſicles began; ſo that this whole Roman year was in courſe agreeably to the Roman manner of computation, conſidered by Diodorus as being *co-numerary* with the Archonſhip and Olympic year of Cteſicles which began in the middle of it*; nevertheleſs the firſt half of this year was really *co-temporary* with the preceding Archonſhip of Exænetus; neither has Diodorus ſaid any thing to the contrary; but only ſaid, that he places the paſſage of Alexander in that Roman year, which the Romans accounted to be co-numerary with Cteſicles; in which he acted rightly. Some late eminent chronologers however and theſe chiefly in our own country have preſumed, that ſome of the Romans at leaſt reckoned in a quite contrary way, namely, that they conſidered every Roman year as co-numerary with the Olympic year, which *ended*, and not which *began* in the middle of it; but that in this they are miſtaken, may be proved by various other

* Latini, ſi dicant, illis conſulibus Olympiadem illam actam fuiſſe, ſtatuunt eoſdem conſules ſex menſibus *prieres* fuiſſe. Conſules enim Romani inibant magiſtratum calendis Januarii, Olympias contra agitur menſe Julio. *Calviſii Chronol.* c. 10.

teſtimonies

teſtimonies in Diodorus and Dionyſius, as well as by this above-mentioned; alſo ſtill more certainly and indubitably by the famous paſſage in the 21ſt chapter of Cenſorinus as will be ſhewn afterward. This however is foreign to our purpoſe at preſent, as is alſo the reaſon why the Romans reckoned in the manner pointed out (for they had a good reaſon); I only intended now to ſhew what I meant by co-numerary, and why I diſtinguiſhed it from co-temporary, namely, in order to put readers on their guard againſt an error in reckoning, which may and often has ariſen from ſaying, that two years are co-temporary, of which the one begins ſix months after the commencement of the other: and moreover in order to ſhew, that a diſtinction muſt be made by readers between thoſe Greek hiſtorians, who wrote before Roman times, or who at leaſt wrote only of Greek affairs, though after the Roman conqueſt of Greece, and another ſet of Greek hiſtorians who wrote profeſſedly of Roman events adjuſted to Roman years and conſulſhips; for the latter will be generally found to adopt the Roman mode (which the former ſet had no motive for doing) and when they place any certain event under ſuch an Archonſhip and Olympic year, they do not mean, that it really happened *in* and was *co-temporary* with that Olympic year; but only that

that it happened within the bounds of that Roman year, which the Romans accounted to be *co-numerary* with ſuch Olympic year in reckoning from the commencement of their æra. Accordingly Vignoles has obſerved, Vulgatiſſimum eſt Plinio et aliis ſcriptoribus annos Olympiadicos *integros* conferre cum annis Julianis, *à quorum medio inchoabantur*: idem fecerunt ſcriptores Græci, quod facile probare poſſem ex variis locis Diodori, Dionyſii, Xenophontis, Ariani, Laertii, et quorum non*? That he ſhould here include Xenophon, who wrote before Roman times, among the reſt, who wrote after, muſt certainly be an error; however as the Olympic dates in Xenophon have been proved by Dodwell to be interpolations, it is immaterial: but ſuch other Greek writers as Arian and Laertius ought to have been alſo not included in the above liſt; becauſe though they wrote after Roman times, yet Arian only wrote of Greek affairs; and Laertius copied many of his extracts and dates from Greek writers, who flouriſhed long before Roman times in Greece; thoſe dates muſt therefore be cautiouſly diſtinguiſhed from the dates of Roman hiſtorians in Greek, ſuch as Diodorus and Dionyſius,

* Epiſtola Chronolog. adverſus Harduinum. Rotterd. 1708.

and

and the collectors who copied from them, ſuch as Pliny, Solinus, and ſometimes Laertius alſo; and before theſe dates be received, it muſt be conſidered, whether they have not given us the Olympic date *co-numerary* with the year of Rome in queſtion, inſtead of the preceding year, which was really co-temporary with the action itſelf.

The Chaldæan year in that celebrated æra called the æra of Nabonaſſar began, during the invaſion by Xerxes, only a few days before the Julian year, and muſt be therefore conſidered in like manner, as co-numerary with the Olympic year, which began ſix months after it, in the middle of that Julian and Chaldæan year; the reaſon of which will be ſhewn in its proper place. The co-numerary dates then in the ſeveral æras under conſideration, are in regard to the invaſion by Xerxes as follow:

Olympiad 75$\frac{4}{4}$ year—Chaldæan year 268—year of Rome 273—year before vulg. æra of Chriſt 480.

Theſe are the approved dates of this event in the beſt modern ſyſtems of chronology, and I find no reaſon of theleaſt moment to doubt the perfect accuracy of them: it may be proper however to make a few obſervations on each to prevent ambiguity. As the year before Chriſt, the Chaldæan year, and the year of Rome begin all

all nearly at the winter ſolſtice, I therefore place the figure 4 over the Olympic year, in order to denote, that it differs from the reſt; for half the 4th year of the preceding Olympiad was co-temporary with the other 3 years in queſtion; becauſe the co-numerary Olympic year does not begin until the midſummer in the middle of thoſe years; for then the Olympic games were celebrated, and then alſo the Archons at Athens entered on their office after the reformation of the calendar by Meto in the 1ſt year of the 87th Olympiad: but whether before this year they did not begin their office at the winter ſolſtice may be a matter of doubt, tho' of no importance to us in our preſent enquiry.

The above date of the year of Rome is agreeable to the Catonian calculation, as it is commonly called; which is that uſed by all antient writers of Roman affairs, except Cenſorinus, Dion Caſſius, and a few Epitomizers. The Varronian method would make it 1 year more, or 2 according to the erroneous opinion of ſome eminent authors; but theſe differences are merely nominal: for notwithſtanding the pretences of Dodwell to the contrary it does no way appear, but that all Roman authors placed Roman events at the *ſame* diſtance from the *expulſion* of the kings, though not at the ſame diſtance from the

foundation of Rome; that is, ſome made Rome to be built a few years ſooner than others, which is of no importance, ſince they all made the Conſuls to begin in the ſame Olympic year: we may therefore juſtly ſay, that there is no difference whatever between the two methods of calculation, except merely in words, and in a ſuppoſition concerning the foundation of Rome, of which nobody could know the truth; therefore there is no reaſon for my preferring the one to the other, except that the chief Roman hiſtorians have adjuſted events to the numbers of Cato.

The Chaldæan year began during the invaſion of Xerxes about the 21ſt of December in the Julian year, which preceded that wherein the invaſion took place. Now as the Chaldæan year had no intercalary day on every fourth year, its New-year's day became moveable, by its beginning 1 day ſooner than the Julian year on every fourth year; ſo that it moved backward in the Julian calendar 1 day in every 4 years; or in other words the Julian year by having an intercalary day every fourth year laſted one day longer than the Chaldæan year, once in every 4 years, and thus gradually began later and later than the Chaldæan year. Now from the data afforded by Ptolomey in his aſtronomy, who has deſcribed eclipſes by this moveable year (whether we call it Chaldæan

dæan or Egyptian, for it ſeems to have been common to both) it has been found, that when the Chaldæan æra of Nabonaſſar began, its 1ſt year began on the 26th of February in the Julian year *; therefore in 268 years, reckoning down to the time of Xerxes, and allowing one day to every 4 years, it muſt have begun ſo many days ſooner than the 26th of February, as that the 1ſt day of the Chaldæan year would fall on the 21ſt of the preceding December. Thus in 1460 Julian years the Chaldæan New-year's day would perform a complete revolution through all the Julian months, and return to the 26th of February again; ſo that in 1460 Julian years there would be reckoned 1461 complete Chaldæan years, the Chaldæan year being ſhorter than the Julian 1 day in every 4 years: but as our ſpace of time concerned amounts only to 268 years, there can never be more than 2 months difference between the 2 years; therefore we may add and ſubſtract Chaldæan and Julian years, as if they were equal in duration, only remembering to take notice on what day of the month any Chaldæan year in queſtion commences. It may be obſerved that in Petavius and ſome chronologic tables

* Dr. Kenedy has lately contended, that it was on the 28th, but this no way affects our reaſoning. *Diſcuſſions on Chronology.*

againſt

againſt the 1ſt year of the 75th Olympiad is marked the Chaldæan year 269; but they do not mean by this, that the 269th Chaldæan year was co-numerary with that Olympic year; they only mean, that the 269th year began in it, namely, near the end of it about about the 21ſt of December: for if the 1ſt Chaldæan year commencing on the 26th of February be conſidered as co-numerary, not with the Olympic year which *ended* at the following midſummer, but with that which *began* then; it follows that in like manner the 1ſt year of the 75th Olympiad muſt be co-numerary with the Chaldæan year which began *before* it, namely, the 268th, and not with the 269th, which began *after* the commencement of that Olympic year, and in the ſame Julian year, but not untill near the end of it in December.

Upon the whole then, we may truly ſay, that all chronologers have now agreed in regard to the dates of this event in queſtion in the ſeveral æras as ſtated above. The older chronologers indeed, Scaliger and others, had ſome doubts, which have been removed by Petavius and later ones: And although Mr. Coſtard has not long ſince renewed ſome of theſe doubts, yet they may be eaſily removed likewiſe; ſo that whatever ſeeming differences may ſubſiſt at preſent, they are only diſ-

agreements

agreements in words and appearance, not in reality. If there be any event in antient hiſtory which can pretend to certainty in point of date, it is this. For theſe reaſons I ſhall not at preſent enter into any juſtification of theſe dates, this will be reſerved for our *ſecond Part*; but I ſhall branch out all ſuperior dates from theſe ſtandards, and hereby rectify ſeveral miſtakes in more antient times, which interfere with the right connexion of ſacred and prophane hiſtory. However, as I ſhall have occaſion repeatedly to make uſe of the Chaldæan æra, it may not be improper to give the reader in a brief manner ſome ſatisfaction with reſpect to the juſtneſs of the date 268, together with proofs occaſionally of the antiquity and authenticity of this æra in general, as well as alſo of the real method of reckoning employed in it: ſince it may happen, that many readers are leſs acquainted with this æra than with the others; and my reaſonings on this ſubject here may help to give them a clear idea of the nature of it; more eſpecially as I ſhall alſo hereby at the ſame time confirm a diſputed point advanced before, that the Romans always reckoned the Olympic year, which began in the middle of any Julian year to be co-numerary with that Julian year and year of Rome, which began ſix months before it.

Now

Now Cenſorinus gives us a celebrated computation in his 21ſt chapter, of which I ſhall only extract what concerns the preſent queſtion. Secundum Varronis rationem, niſi fallor, hic annus, cujus velut index et titulus quidam eſt, Ulpii et Pontiani conſulatus, ab Olympiade prima milleſimus eſt et quartus decimus, ex diebus *duntaxat* æſtivis, quibus Agon Olympicus celebratur; a Roma autem condita 991mus *et quidem* ex parilibus, unde anni urbis numerantur—ab Egyptiis quidam anni in literis relati ſunt, ut quos Nabonnazaru nominant, quod a primo imperii ejus anno conſurgunt, quorum *hic* 986tus—ſed horum initia ſemper a primo die menſis ejus ſumuntur, cui apud Egyptios nomen eſt Thoth, quique *hoc anno fuit* ante diem 7 Kal. Julii. Hence it appears, that Cenſorinus dated his time of writing from *after* the end of June; becauſe he ſpeaks of the 7th of the Kalends of July as being paſt in that Julian year, wherein he wrote *; which day he points out as the beginning of the Chaldæan year 986. In like manner he points out, that the Olympic year 1014 is to be reckoned *only*

* Mr. Coſtard in his Hiſtory of Aſtronomy ſays, that Cenſorinus wrote *in the beginning* of the year 991; but this, we ſee, is a miſtake, and would make an error of one year; for the *beginning* of that year was in the Chaldæan year 985.

from

from the ſummer ſolſtice of that year wherein he wrote (ex diebus *duntaxat* æſtivis) it began therefore nearly about the ſame time with the Chaldæan year; whereas he ſhews that the Varronian year of Rome 991 (the 990th of Cato) muſt be reckoned *as far back* as from the Parilia, which were celebrated on the 21ſt of April, *et quidem* ex Parilibus; this is the force of *et quidem*; and he goes on to ſhew, that the co-numerary Julian year muſt be reckoned as far back as from the 1ſt of January (ex die Kal. Jan.). By his thus accurately pointing out not only the dates of the years in queſtion, and the general time of their commencement in the different æras, but alſo the different ſituations of thoſe commencements with reſpect to that particular time of the Julian year, at which he dated his book in the 991ſt year of Rome, it appears, that he reckoned the Olympic year, which began in the middle of the Varronian year 991, to be co-numerary therewith (agreeably to what I mentioned before as being undoubtedly the practice of the Romans) for he dates from the Olympic year after the ſummer ſolſtice (ex diebus duntaxat æſtivis) and from the Chaldæan year after the 25th of June (the 7th of the Kalends of July) and yet calls the Roman year 991, which began in January before,

hic

hic annus. Now this Olympic year being (as he ſays) the 1014th, and this Chaldæan year being (as he ſays) the 986th, it will follow, that the 297th Olympic year (the 1ſt of 75th Olympiad) muſt be co-numerary with the Chaldæan year 268; for if the 1ſt Chaldæan year beginning on the 26th of February be reckoned as co-numerary with the Olympic year, which began at the following Midſummer (and theſe years certainly both are and ought to be conſidered as co-numerary, ſince they were for the greater part of the time really co-temporary) it follows, that no ſucceeding Chaldæan year can ever begin at leſs than four months before its reſpectively co-numerary Olympic year; but gradually more and more before it in a longer duration of time, on account of the retrogradation of the Chaldæan new year's day: therefore the 986th year, beginning on the 7th of Kal. of July, muſt be co-numerary, not with the 1014th Olympic year, which began nearly about the ſame time, but with the following Olympic year 1015, beginning 12 months afterwards; that is, theſe are the two years, which are diſtant an *equal number* from the 1ſt Chaldæan year; the Chaldæan new year's day having in 986 years gone back from the 26th of February to the 7th of the Kal. of

July

July in the preceding Julian year *. Now if 297 Olympic years be deducted from 1015, there remain 718 Olympic years; and if this *ſame number* of intermediate years 718 be deducted from 986 Chaldæan years, there will remain 268 Chaldæan ones; therefore the 268th Chaldæan year muſt be co-numerary with the 297th Olympic year, and began about the 21ſt of December in the Julian year next before that 297th Olympic year, in which Xerxes invaded Greece. Accordingly all chronologers have agreed concerning theſe two years being co-numerary, and, as I have ſhewn, with good reaſon; for I avoid taking any thing merely on truſt from others, without having convincing proofs of the truth of it; Cenſorinus moreover has fixed the year of his own date by ſo many other co-temporary dates

* Jackſon, from not attending to Cenſorinus's mention of the 7th of Kal. of July as being paſt, has made an error of one year in the following paſſage: "From the year before Chriſt 747 to the year of Chriſt 238, (in which Cenſorinus wrote) there are 984 years, ſo Cenſorinus reckoned the time of his writing to be in the 985th year, not in the 986th, as the preſent text has it." *Chron. Ant. Vol.* 1. *p.* 435. That is, he ſuppoſed Cenſorinus to date from the beginning of the year 238, like Mr. Coſtard, and not from after the ſummer ſolſtice in it, at which began both a new Chaldæan year and new Olympic year. But Petavius had more juſtly ſaid, Cenſorinus anno (ſc. hoc Juliano) *cæpiſſe* dicit 986 annum Nabonaſari. *Ration. Temp. Pars* 2*da*, *lib.* 3. *c.* 3.

(no leſs than ſix) that it is impoſſible there can be any error in the text: Petavius has juſtly obſerved on all theſe dates, that hæc omnia in eundem conſpirant limitem anni illius, quem poſui, 238 poſt Chriſtum) Ditto lib. 4. c. 8.

On theſe two co-numerary years we may therefore reſt, as upon a ſolid foundation in our calculations upward: however in order to manifeſt ſtill more clearly the accuracy of theſe particular dates, and at the ſame time the perfect accuracy of the Chaldæan æra in general, I ſhall add a proof from Thucydides; who has preſerved an original document, the third treaty of peace between Tiſſaphernes and the Peloponneſians, which begins with its date "In the 13th year of the reign of Darius &c." * viz. Darius the 2d. Now Thucydides ſhews, that this treaty was made in the winter of the 20th year of the Peloponneſian war; which began, as all authors agree, in the ſpring of the firſt year of 87th Olymp. and therefore not long before the beginning of the ſecond year From 86 Olympiads then and one year deduct. 74 Olympiads and one year, there remain 12 complete Olympiads, equal to 48 Olympic years; on adding 20 years more unto the end of the winter of the 20th year of the war, they

* Lib. 8.

amoun

amount to 68 Olympic years; which added to 268 Chaldæan years make 336 combined years; but as the 268th Chaldæan year ended about the 21ſt of December before the end of the firſt year of 75th Olymp. therefore thoſe combined 336 years muſt alſo end about the 21ſt of December in the winter before the end of the 20th year of the war; and as during theſe 68 years the Chaldæan new year's day had gone back as far as to the 4th of December; therefore on reducing the 68 Olympic years to 68 Chaldæan years, the above 336 Chaldæan years would end about the 4th of December in the year as before: conſequently all the winter of the 20th year after the 4th of December, would fall in the 337th Chaldæan year. Now if we turn to the Chaldæan æra produced afterwards we ſhall find, that according to this table the 13th year of Darius actually began with the 337th year; for his predeceſſor Artaxerxes ended with the 324th, to which adding 13, they make 337. This exact coincidence between two authors at 650 years diſtance could not be the effect of mere accident, but proves both that there is no error in this table of the Chaldæan æra in its general ſum from its beginning down to the 13th of Darius, any more than from thence down to the time of Cenſorinus; and alſo that the 268th year in particular muſt be co-nu-

merary with the first of 75th Olympiad; for it is sufficiently evident from Thucydides that the treaty in question was not signed in the first part of the winter in question before the 4th of December, and also that the first year of the war began in the spring, which concluded the first year of 87th Ol. since he expressly mentions, that the Olympic Games were celebrated in the summer of the 4th year of the war, at which therefore the 88th Olympiad must have commenced (lib. 3.)

Our foundation date then in the Chaldæan æra appears to rest upon a solid basis. There are however two and only two articles, in which authors disagree concerning this event; one of which is, the names of the Roman Consuls in the year in question; and the other, the year of the reign of Xerxes, in which his invasion took place: but the former is of no moment to ascertain the right year of Rome, neither have we any accurate list of Consuls, on which we can depend; and the latter is indubitably determined by the Chaldæan æra, to have been the 6th year of his reign. Here however an objection may be still raised; for it may be said, that the Chaldæan æra disagrees in this point with Herodotus and the Parian marbles; but these are questions reserved for our *second* part. Nevertheless it may not be improper at present to give this

brief anſwer, that notwithſtanding all authors have ſuppoſed, that Herodotus places the invaſion of Xerxes in his 8th, 9th, and even 10th year; yet the words of that hiſtorian may juſt as well be underſtood to mean the 6th year, they even cannot be underſtood otherwiſe, without making him guilty of a contradiction; and it is ſurprizing, that no perſon has hitherto obſerved this: moreover even if Herodotus had diſagreed with the Chaldæan æra, yet Thucydides and others will be found to agree with it by placing this invaſion in the 6th year. As to the Parian marbles, though they more certainly place the invaſion in the 9th of Xerxes, yet the date there of the acceſſion of his predeceſſor Darius contains a tacit confeſſion of the error; for they give to him only 28 years, or at moſt 31 according to the ſuppoſed reading of ſome perſons, inſtead of 36 with Herodotus, Euſebius, the Chaldæan æra and others; which ſhews, that they were forced to ſubſtract ſeveral years from the predeceſſor, becauſe they had allowed too many to the ſucceſſor. This diſagreement then can be of no moment againſt ſo many other more weighty proofs: accordingly moſt chronologers have nevertheleſs agreed to place this invaſion in the 6th year of Xerxes. This is all, which it ſeems requiſite to ſay at preſent in ſupport of our foundation dates.

Different

Different Corruptions of the Chaldæan æra by different Chronologers during the Jewiſh captivity to Babylon.

THE ancient chriſtian chronologers Africanus, Euſebius and others had no juſt conception when this captivity began or ended; which is however the firſt neceſſary ſtep to be fixed in our reſearches into more ancient times; for every higher date in the Old Teſtament depends on the dates of theſe two events below. Thoſe ancient chriſtians had found mention made in ſcripture, that the great captivity to Babylon ended at the firſt year of Cyrus king of Perſia, therefore they ſuppoſed, that it was on that year, in which Cyrus became king of Perſia and Media by the conqueſt of Aſtyages *; hence they threw back the beginning of the 70 years prophecied of by Jeremiah to the 13th of Joſiah, in which Jeremiah firſt began to propheſy †; and which was indeed about 70 years before the acceſſion of Cyrus to the kingdom of Perſia. Yet the Jewiſh hiſtorian Joſephus, who wrote 150

* Μετα δε ὁ της αιχμαλωσιας ετη Κυρος Περσων εβασιλευσεν, ὡ ἑτει Ολυμπιας ηχθη νε. *Africanus in Euſeb. Præp. Evang.* lib. 10.

† Jerem. c. 25. 3.

years

years before Africanus, had given them better information; as alſo had the ſcripture itſelf: for although the end of this captivity is ſometimes ambiguouſly mentioned in ſcripture, as being in the firſt year of Cyrus *king of Perſia*, yet in one place it is expreſly ſaid to have been in the firſt year of *Cyrus king of Babylon* §; and elſewhere the chief body of the Jews and their ſacred veſſels are alſo ſaid to have been detained in Babylon itſelf ‡. This gives us no favourable idea of the accuracy of theſe chriſtian chronologers, who could thus make Cyrus deliver the Jews from Babylon 20 years before he was maſter of the city. This error however ended with itſelf, and produced no errors elſewhere; but a ſecond miſtake they fell into was attended with worſe conſequences; for they conceived, not only that 70 years were predicted by Jeremiah for the duration of the captivity, but alſo that Zechariah had made the ſame number between the deſtruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, and the edict for its being rebuilt in the 2d year of Darius the firſt *. But inſtead of examin-

§ Eſra c. 5. 13.

‡ Eſra c. 1. v. 7 & 11.

* Sententiæ noſtræ congruit Clemens—Supputari 70 annos deſolationis templi uſque in ſecundum annum Darii. *Euſebii Chron. ad Olymp.* 47.—deſolationis templi ſub Dario rege complentur anni 70. *Ad Olymp.* 59 & 64.—Zechariah ch. 1. 12 and 7. 5.

ing,

ing, whether there were really 70 years between these two last events, they took the fact for granted and stretched them out to full 70, if they did not find them so many; but in order to effect this they were forced to lengthen and alter the reigns of cotemporary prophane kings. This is a capital defect in the Chronicon of Eusebius, for it affects a variety of other dates, and in his preface he professes to establish his system upon this very principle; *Si quis, retrorsum annorum supputans numerum, secundum Darii regis, quærat annum, sub quo Hierosolymorum, quod a Babyloniis destructum fuerat, instauratum est, reperiet a Tiberio usque ad Darium annos 548—Deinde secundo Darii anno 70mus desolationis templi annus expletur.* Accordingly, if we turn to his Chronicon, we find, that he has placed the 2d year of Darius perfectly right on the 1st year of the 65th Olympiad; but has made also exactly 70 years between the above date, and the destruction of the temple, exclusive of both the extreme years, which is not right; for in order to effect this, he has added 5 years too many to the cotemporary prophane kings, particularly one year to the Magian Smerdis, whose reign of no more than 7 months was included already in the 1st of Darius, and one year too much to Cyrus; whereby the first of Cyrus is placed

2 years

2 years too high; and all the kings of the Jews, at leaſt 5 years too high, together with all prophane kings before Cyrus.

Such being the conduct of antient chronologers in corrupting chronology through ill-founded ſuppoſitions of their own, let us next turn to the conduct of the moderns; and we ſhall find that Petavius, Uſher, Prideaux and Blair have indeed corrected the firſt of theſe two errors; yet in doing this, they have introduced new errors, very nearly as conſiderable, in place of the old ones: but in regard to the ſecond error, they have never yet corrected it except in part; and through the new errors introduced in the foregoing caſe, added to thoſe left uncorrected in the latter, they alſo have raiſed up the whole liſt of Jewiſh kings, two, three or four years too high, and this in like manner by ill-founded ſuppoſitions of their own, which they preferred to the more accurate accounts of prophane authors. Theſe errors, though not conſiderable in themſelves, united with ſome others, we ſhall find however to have produced together ſufficient conſequences to make prophane dates and thoſe of ſcripture diſagree; whereas, if theſe errors had not been made, they would have been all conſiſtent and in the moſt perfect harmony; particularly, ſeveral paſſages in the prophecies have hereby been made to appear

obſcure or to be underſtood in erroneous ſenſes. Having pointed out the errors of the antient chriſtians, it remains to point out alſo more particularly wherein the moderns have made other errors in correcting the antients. Now in correcting the firſt of theſe two errors, Petavius, Uſher, Prideaux and Blair's Tables have rightly brought down the delivery of the Jews as low as the capture of Babylon by Cyrus; but it will be found that they have all placed this capture at leaſt 2 years too high, by not perfectly conceiving the right method of reckoning made uſe of in the Chaldæan æra, commonly but improperly called Ptolomey's Canon. Again, they have on the contrary brought down the beginning of the captivity 1 year too low, by placing the firſt capture of Jeruſalem by Nebuchadnezzar on the 4th inſtead of the 3d of Jehoiakim; after thus abridging the duration of the captivity at both ends, they found it contained only 67 years (including both extremes, viz. the 4th of Jehoiakim and the 1ſt of Cyrus) according to the number of years attributed to Nebuchadnezzar and his ſucceſſors in the Chaldæan æra. Hence they were led to ſuppoſe, that there muſt be ſome error in the Chaldæan æra, becauſe it ſeemed to make fewer than the 70 years propheſied of by Jeremiah: and in conſequence they ſet themſelves upon interpolat-

ing

ing or altering this æra in different ways according to the fancies and ſuppoſitions of different chronologers, in order to ſtretch out again theſe 67 to full 70 years; in which they have manifeſted more zeal than fidelity, and the errors thus introduced, ſtill require to be corrected as much as thoſe of Euſebius. Let us take a brief view of their ſeveral ſchemes of alteration and interpolation, referring the reader to the table of the Chaldean æra inſerted a few pages hence.

It is plain by this table of reigns, that (Nebuchadnezzar (Nabocolaſſarus) began with the 144th Chaldæan year; yet Petavius places his commencement 3 years ſooner, namely in the 141ſt year; and as it is mentioned in Jeremiah * with repeated confirmations in other places, that the 4th of Jehoiakim was cotemporary with the firſt of Nebuchadnezzar, Petavius accordingly raiſes up the 4th of Jehoiakim 3 years higher alſo; by which means he gets 3 additional years for the duration of the captivity, and completes the 67 to full 70 years. However he gives to Nebuchadnezzar no more than the 43 years aſſigned to him in the Chaldæan æra, and divides the three acquired years among the ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar: but in order that he might

* C. 25. 1 & 32. 1.—2 K. 24. 12: & 25. 8.

not augment the total number of the Chaldæan æra by theſe 3 acquired years (whereby he would make Ptolomey to have miſplaced every eclipſe, calculated by this æra, the ſame number of years) he therefore borrows theſe 3 years from Nabopolaſar Nebuchadnezzar's predeceſſor allowing to the former only 18 years, although he acknowledges that according to the Chaldæan table he reigned 21: in this then he acted prudently at leaſt; ſince he preſerves the integrity of the Chaldæan æra every where elſe, and there are no eclipſes recorded by Ptolomey between the 18th of Nabopolaſar and the end of Nebuchadnezzar's ſucceſſors, with whom the captivity ended.

Uſher has not acted ſo prudently; he borrows but two years from Nabopolaſar, which he annexes to Nebuchadnezzar himſelf, giving him 45 years of reign inſtead of 43; the two firſt however Uſher ſuppoſes Nebuchadnezzar to have reigned as aſſociate only to his father; and that the Jews on ſeeing Nebuchadnezzar at the head of the army beſieging Jeruſalem, imagined him to be already King and from thence dated his commencement, although in fact his father did not die until two years after. Thus he makes a double commencement of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, one by the Chaldæans at the real death of the old King as in the Chaldæan æra; and a prior one

two

two years before in the reckoning of the Jews only: And as he alſo raiſes up the fourth of Jehoiakim to the firſt year of Nebuchadnezzar according to the Jewiſh reckoning, hereby he gets two additional years to augment the 67 to 69. But this not ſeeming ſufficient, he performs another operation upon the mutilated Chaldæan æra. Joſephus had quoted a paſſage from Beroſus's hiſtory of Babylonia, in which he mentions a King (Laboroſoarchod) among the ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar, whoſe name does not appear in the Chaldæan æra; and who reigned only nine months, which months Uſher erroneouſly ſuppoſed to be omitted altogether in the Chaldæan table, becauſe the King's name is omitted; whereas in fact it was the method obſerved in that table never to mention any King who did not reign a full year, in order to avoid errors ariſing from odd months, but nevertheleſs to include thoſe odd months in the firſt year of the ſucceſſor. Uſher however allows one whole year to this King, and by the interpolation of this year he raiſes up the fourth of Jehoiakim and the firſt of Nebuchadnezzar one year more, and thus gets three additional years: but what is ſtill worſe, he does not cut off this laſt-mentioned year from the predeceſſor, as he does the other two, but carries back the alteration from the 193d year as far up as to the

the 45th; where he ſuppreſſes one out of the two years allowed by the Chaldæan table to the interregnum, and thus reſtores the ſuperior part of that table to its integrity again. But he had cauſed diſcordancy enough already, for during this intermediate time, there is an eclipſe recorded in Ptolomey on the fifth year of Nabopolaſar and in the 127th year of the æra; which eclipſe would therefore be placed in the 126th year by Uſher, as he has ſuppreſſed one out of the two years allowed to the interregnum; and thus Ptolomey would have made an error of one whole year; for he expreſsly reckons 126 years and 86 days down to this eclipſe *. If Uſher had not ſuppreſſed this interpolated year at the interregnum the caſe would have been ſtill worſe; for then the date of every eclipſe mentioned in Ptolomey after the 193d year (which are 9 or 10) would have been all in the contrary error of containing one year too little: neither was there the leaſt occaſion for this interpolation; for as Uſher adds alſo two years more to the captivity at the end of theſe 70, by allowing two years to the reign of a ſuppoſititious Cyaxares the ſecond, he therefore makes upon the whole

* Τω ε ετει Ναϐοπολλασȣ, ὁ εστιν ρκζ ετος—εν Βαβυλωνι ηρξατο ἡ σεληνη εκλειπειν.—συναγει ὁ απο της εποχης χρονος ετη ρκϛ και ἡμερας πϛ. lib. 5. 13.

72 years

72 years of captivity, including both the extreme years.

Prideaux ſaw this, and therefore prudently retrenched that interpolated year, which alone affected the dates in Ptolomey; but in every other reſpect he follows the ſcheme of Uſher, and thereby although he has preſerved the integrity of the Chaldæan æra, yet he has made the Jewiſh reckoning to differ from it two years at the commencement of Nebuchadnezzar; conſequently he has placed every Jewiſh King and event both above and below two years too high, and alſo, like Uſher, has taken away two years from the nine given to Cyrus by the Chaldæan æra; which two he allows to a ſuppoſititious Cyaxares, although there is no ſuch name in the Chaldæan æra, nor to be found in any antient author, except in the Romance of Xenophon, and in Joſephus, who copied his account from Xenophon. Dr. Blair in his tables has followed Prideaux.

Jackſon has invented a different plan of mutilation from all former authors: for he makes the Jews to begin the firſt of Nebuchadnezzar at the ſame time with the Chaldæan æra in the 144th year; conſequently there alſo he places the fourth of Jehoiakim, and corrects the above error of two years in Prideaux concerning the Jewiſh reigns; he gives alſo to Nebuchadnezzar no more than his

his right number of 43 years. But though he thus keeps all dates right and agreeable to the Chaldæan æra before the beginning of the captivity, yet he commits greater errors than any author below: for he interpolates two whole years instead of one into the Chaldæan æra, which he distributes among the successors of Nebuchadnezzar; and thus by including also the first of Cyrus he stretches out the 67 to full 70 years. Hereby he makes Ptolomey misdate every eclipse mentioned by him after the captivity, and give to each two years too little; namely one eclipse in the 7th of Cambyses, which Ptolomey calls the 225th Chaldæan year * as it is also by the reckoning in the Chaldæan table; but which ought according to Jackson's scheme to be the 227th; two others in the reign of Darius, and three in the reign of Artaxerxes, every one of which must thus have been in like manner dated by Ptolomey two years too early. We see it was necessary for one, who adopted such a scheme as this, to contend (as Jackson does) that Ptolomey was himself the author of the Chaldæan table of reigns, with which every one of Ptolomey's dates agree; and that we are indebted to Ptolomey him-

* Τω ἔτει ζ Καμβυσου, ὁ εστι σκε ἔτος απο Ναβονασαρου. lib. 5. 13.

self

ſelf for all theſe blunders. But which of the two is moſt right we may conceive from this ſingle proof: I have ſhewn that the dates of Ptolomey and of the Chaldæan table and of Cenſorinus all agree in placing the commencement of the 13th of Darius the ſecond in the winter of the 20th year of the Peloponneſian war, where Thucydides alſo places it; whereas according to Jackſon it would have fallen two full years later; for he carries down theſe two interpolated years below Darius and unto the end of the reign of Artaxerxes the ſecond, to whom he allows but 43 years inſtead of 46 as in the Chaldæan table. Here then he retrenches three years inſtead of two; by which means he makes a contrary error in every ſucceeding year after Artaxerxes, and ſuppoſes Ptolomey to date every eclipſe mentioned after that reign (of which there are ſeveral) by one year more than he ought. Thus Jackſon makes the ſum total of the Chaldæan æra to be only 423 years inſtead of 424: yet Syncellus about the year of Chriſt 780 acknowledges, that though the tables of the Chaldæan æra differed in ſome of the particular numbers, they all agreed in making the ſum total to be 424 years †; and

† Εισιν ουν, ὡς προκειται εν Κανονῳ, οἱ αυλοι απο Ναβονασσαρου χρονοι υκδ, καἰα τε την μαθηματικην και εκκλησιατἰκην εκδοσιν· τα μεν καθ' ὁλου ἑιη τα αυἰα συναγονἰες υκδ, τα δε καἰα μερος ου πανταχοῦ τα αυτα. *Syncell. Chronog. edit. a Goar, p.* 207.

moreover not the Chaldæan table and Ptolomey himſelf give this number *, but Theon 200 years after him has confirmed the ſame ‡.

All foreign authors have in like manner adopted more or leſs ſome of theſe corruptions of the Chaldæan æra. Bengelius, one of the laſt and moſt learned lays it down as a certain principle, that Nebuchadnezzaris annos extendere, adeoque Nabopolaſari contrahere ſcripturæ nos *cogit* veritas §: accordingly he gives to Nebuchadnezzar 44 years, and has ſome other peculiar varieties.

However then theſe modern chronologers may have differed in other reſpects, yet in this one point they agree, that although they have all præiſed this Chaldæan æra, not any one of them has hitherto adhered to it: but on the contrary they have all thought themſelves at liberty to deviate from it whenever they pleaſed; and in the ſame breath, that they juſtly acknowledge it to be of great ſervice in confirming the ſcripture chronology and hiſtory, they have nevertheleſs weakened its authority by rejecting its teſtimony in an humourſome manner, whenever it did not ſeem to them to

* Απο Ναβονασαρου Βασιλειας μεχρι της Αλεξανδρου τελευτης ειη υκδ. lib. 3, 5.

‡ Τα μεχρι της Αλεξανδρου τελευτης ειη υκδ. *Comment.* lib. 6. 2.

§ Ordo temporum, p. 177. Stut. 9.

agree

agree with ſcripture; by pretending to diſcover errors in it, which ariſe only from their own falſe reaſonings, and by making corruptions in it under the ſpecious name of corrections: Marſham had long ago complained of this, yet inſtead of diminiſhing the practice has nevertheleſs increaſed ||. Petavius began, Uſher purſued, and Jackſon has completed the plan; which is alſo the leſs deſerving of excuſe, becauſe their pretended corrections are totally unneceſſary; for when the real method of reckoning employed in this æra ſhall be ſtrictly adhered to, it will be found, that it actually makes full 70 years from the beginning to the end of the captivity, or at leaſt ſo very near it, that no one can pretend to ſay, the prophecy of Jeremiah was not completely fulfilled: which I ſhould now proceed to ſhew; but it will be neceſſary previouſly to preſent the readers with the whole Chaldæan æra itſelf from the firſt edition by Calviſius, and to explain the right method of reckoning by it, together with further proofs in favour of its authenticity derived from its antiquity.

|| Canonis Nabonaſſaræi tanta eſt cum ſacris literis congruentia, ut ſine illo vix eſſet ullus ab hiſtoria ſacra ad exoticam tranſitus—multis compaginibus cum ſacro textu aptiſſime connectitur—Chronographi Chriſtiani futilibus conjecturis nimium indulgentes, miris modis Canonem hunc caſtigarunt vel potius conturbarunt, p. 506.

Antiquity and Authenticity of the Chaldæan æra, together with Proofs that the method of reckoning employed in it is different from what the above authors have ſuppoſed.

Table of Reigns of Aſſyrians and Medes.

			Collected years.
Feb. 26.	Nabonaſſarus	years 14	14
	Nadius	2	16
	Chinzirus & Porus	5	21
	Jugæus	5	26
Feb. 20.	Mardocempadus	12	38*
	Arkianus	5	43
	Firſt Interregnum	2	45
	Belibus	3	48
	Apronadius	6	54
	Rigebelus	1	55
	Meſſeſſimordacus	4	59
	Second Interregnum	8	67
	Aſſaradinus	13	80
	Saoſducheus	20	100
Feb. 1.	Chyniladanus	22	122
Jan. 27.	Nabopollaſſarus	21	143†
21.	Nabocolaſſarus	43	186
	Ilovarodamus	2	188
	Niricolaſſarus	4	192
9.	Nabonadius	17	209

* In 1ſt year an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon; 2d year 2 eclipſes obſerved at Babylon.

† In 5th, an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon.

Of

Of Perſians.

			Collected years.
5.	Cyrus	9	218
	Cambyſes	8	226*
Jan. 1.	Darius 1ſt.	36	262†
Dec. 23.	Xerxes	21	283
17.	Artaxerxes 1ſt.	41	324
7.	Darius 2d.	19	343
2.	Artaxerxes 2d.	46	389‡
Nov. 21.	Ochus	21	410
16.	Aroſtus	2	412
15.	Darius 3d.	4	416

Of Grecians.

14.	Alexander the Macedonian	8	424

			Collected years.
12.	Phillipus Aridæi	years 7	7
	&c. &c.	&c.	&c.

To the above Table is ſubjoined in the edition of Calviſius and all others another table containing the æra of Alexander's death, or

* In 7th, an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon.

† In 20th, an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon; 31ſt, an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon.

‡ In 23d, 2 eclipſes obſerved at Babylon; 24th, an eclipſe obſerved at Babylon.

æra

æra of Philip Aridæus (as it is indifferently called) who was brother and nominal ſucceſſor to Alexander; but this being poſterior to the times under our preſent conſideration, there is no reaſon for its being copied here.

Now Herodotus is the only prophane hiſtorian extant, who has given any certain relation of the conqueſt of Babylon by Cyrus; for that of Xenophon is profeſſedly fictitious, although perhaps as near to truth, as he thought expedient for his purpoſe of a political romance: but Herodotus has unfortunately annexed no date, nor any circumſtances, which might lead the way to aſcertain the date of this event, excepting only, that it happened ſeveral years after Cyrus had deſtroyed the kingdom of Lydia. Herodotus indeed did not intend his relation as any thing more than a brief ſummary of hiſtoric events concerning Babylon, which he promiſed to relate more at large in a profeſſed hiſtory of that kingdom; but which he either never compoſed, or it has not been preſerved. Happily however the date of this conqueſt has been preſerved in the above table of the Chaldæan æra; by which it ſhould ſeem to have been effected 9 full years before the death of Cyrus, and at the end of the 209th Chaldæan year. Hereby the date will be in courſe determined in the æra of Olympiads alſo, by reckoning backward from

our

our foundation date; as ſoon as we rightly comprehend the method of reckoning employed in this æra, and are convinced of the accuracy of the above table: but as doubts have been raiſed and miſtakes made concerning both theſe points, it is neceſſary to remove theſe doubts, before we can aſcend up to more antient times, by better aſcertaining both the authenticity and method of this æra, in order to prevent any corruption of the dates of it, under pretence of correcting them.

Calviſius, who juſtly calls the above table *omni auro pretioſior*, adds, that if it had been ſooner known, chronologers would not have been ſo divided in their opinions; nevertheleſs the real fact is as I have ſhewn, that they are ſtill not leſs divided than before. Euſebius appears to have known of this table of Chaldæan reigns, but as he has inſerted no liſt of the Chaldæan Kings in his Chronicon, he had no opportunity to make uſe of it *. Georgius Monachus, called Syncellus from his office, is the oldeſt chriſtian author extant, who has given us any table of this æra, viz. in his Chronographia compoſed about the year 780, but both his copies inſerted there are corrupted in ſeveral places, and apparently through

* In medio quidem tempore Chaldæi prope prævalebant, quorum ſeparatæ quædam ſucceſſiones regum feruntur, *ad Arbacem.*

the

the very ſame cauſe, as by the moderns, a deſire of forcing them to make out full 70 years during the captivity of the Jews to Babylon: He calls one of theſe a mathematical and aſtronomical copy †, pretending that it is the ſame as that aſtronomical one made uſe of by Ptolomey; which it certainly is not; and the other he calls an eccleſiaſtic copy, being partly taken from the account of Joſephus, and partly from Africanus and other chriſtian hiſtorians ‡: but both of thoſe copies agree in this point, that they have two interpolated years under the ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar, like Petavius and Jackſon; which plan indeed theſe two authors borrowed from thoſe copies of Syncellus; and in this they all differ from the above Chaldæan table, which gives but ſix years to Evilmerodach and Nerigliſſar together (Ilouarodamus and Nericolaſſarus) whereas the copies of Syncellus give them eight; yet with this difference, that one copy gives to Evilmerodach three and to Nerigliſſar five; while the other gives five to the former and only three to the latter; thus they neither agree with each other any more than with the above table. But what is ſtill worſe, Syncellus pretends that one of theſe copies is the

† Κατα αστρονομικον Κανονα. p. 207.

‡ See page 147 in note.

very

very one made uſe of by Ptolomey, although it materially differs from the dates of Ptolomey in ſeveral other points beſides thoſe above-mentioned. Theſe diſagreements ſhew, that there is no kind of dependance to be placed on either of theſe copies of Syncellus; accordingly Marſham thought they deſerved no other refutation than the following cenſure, *utraque diverſis modis peſſimè depravata eſt* (de æra Nabon.) yet theſe are the copies, which Petavius in part preferred, and which Jackſon has again lately attempted to defend.

About 960 an anonymous chronology was compoſed, which gives us only a part of the Chaldæan table, but juſt as badly disfigured; it preſerves particularly the above error of two years under the ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar*. In 1606 Scaliger republiſhed the copy of Syncellus in his edition of the pretended Greek of Euſebius's Chronicon, but ſtill more by corrections of his own.

In 1613 Calviſius in his *Opus Chronologicum* publiſhed the firſt correct edition of this æra from a copy ſent to him by Dr. Overall Dean of St. Paul's, and tranſcribed from the original found accidentally annexed to a manuſcript of Ptolomey's aſtronomy†. Never-

* Inſerted in Scaliger's *Emendatio Tempor.* p. 743.

† Hunc canonem integrum et incorruptum ex m^sto exemplari Ptolomæi, quod habetur Londini beneficio D. Overalli Dec. Eccl. Paul. accepi. *Calviſ de Epoch. Nabon.*

 theleſs

theleſs Petavius in his *Doctrina Temporum* publiſhed in 1627 would not abide by this copy of Calviſius, but preferred the erroneous one of Syncellus. Vignoles ſuggeſts, that the reaſon might be, becauſe this of Calviſius was recommended at firſt by Proteſtant authors; while the copy of Syncellus by having paſſed through the hands of antient chriſtian hiſtorians had gained the additional authority of being an eccleſiaſtic computation: but whether that motive might have any influence or not, he perſiſted afterwards in his *Rationarium Temporum* publiſhed in 1672, under pretence, that it agreed better with Beroſus and with hiſtory; which it really does not *. At the end of the ſame work however he publiſhed a ſecond edition of the above Chaldæan table, from a manuſcript found annexed to a manuſcript copy of Theon's Commentaries on Ptolomey, collated with another antient manuſcript of the ſame in the French King's library; both which agree intirely with that of Calviſius, except in ſpelling ſome of the names †. But what adds ſtill more to

* Beroſo potius aſſentimur; nam canonis (Ptolomæi) ſumma minus cum hiſtoria congruit Pars 2. lib. 3. c. 5.

† Utile viſum eſt canonem hoc loco deſcribere, cujus modi veteribus m^ss^ legitur et nos eundem in Theonis commentariis deprehendimus. Hunc porro ex Græco codice vetuſto Bibl. Regiæ non nihil caſtigavimus, variantes itidem lectiones ad ſcripſimus. *Append.*

the

the authenticity of theſe is, that they agree intirely likewiſe with all the dates found mentioned in Ptolomey's Aſtronomy and the Commentary of Theon, as well as with the above-mentioned dates in Cenſorinus and Thucydides: this Jackſon himſelf acknowledges, who has compared all the dates in Ptolomey, being above 20, with the above table and confeſſes, "that all his computations agree exactly to the numbers of the Aſtronomical Canon, and confirm the truth of the copies, whence they were taken." Vol. 1. p. 450. Nevertheleſs he ſtill maintains, that "It is not infallible;" for "Ptolomey finding no odd months mentioned in Beroſus, except the nine months of Laboroſoarchod, he has omitted the latter, and ſet down no more than ſix years for the reigns of two other ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar inſtead of eight; ſo there is an error of two years, not in the preſent copies of the Canon, but in Ptolomey's Canon itſelf; which error we have much better evidence to prove, than any that can be alledged for the Canon," p. 444. Thus then we ſee, that this pretended error is hereby made common to all the computations in Ptolomey's aſtronomy, as well as to the above table of the æra; Jackſon indeed was forced into this laſt deſperate ſuppoſition, becauſe it was certain, that Ptolomey's computations all agreed with the

table; he therefore had no reſource except in ſuppoſing that Ptolomey was himſelf the compiler of the table, and had made errors throughout the whole of his computations, as well as in the table itſelf: Petavius was of the ſame opinion *. Both authors alſo agreed, that Ptolomey had made another error of one year in the following æra of Philip Aridæus among the Roman Emperors after Caligula; of which æra they in like manner ſuppoſed Ptolomey to have been the compiler; but in oppoſition to which it is ſufficient to obſerve, that this accuſation is already refuted with reſpect to the ſum total, by my having ſhewn that the date of Cenſorinus agrees with that of Thucydides; and it will be afterwards farther refuted, by ſhewing, that this laſt pretended error ariſes only from a miſtake common to both authors in their not having conceived rightly the real method of reckoning made uſe of in the æra of Philip as well as in the Chaldæan æra †.

Petavius

* In *Ptolomaicum* Canonem incidi, qui inſcribitur Κανων Βασιλειων, in quo Regum a Nabonaſſaro ſeries continetur *Doctr. Temp.* 11. 21.—Obſervavimus Canonem quendam principum *a Ptolomæo* eſſe confectum, &c. *Ration. Temp.* p. 2. l. 4. c. 6.

† Obſervationum exempla, quæ a Ptolomæo memorantur, ſive Adriani annis inſcripta, ſive Antonini, omnia *uno anno* amborum epochas antevertunt—nos certam illius rationem

Petavius and Jackſon indeed both intimate farther in ſupport of their accuſation, that the cómputation they adopt, agrees with that of Beroſus; but this again certainly is not true; on the contrary Beroſus entirely agrees with the dates in the Chaldæan table, as will be ſhewn. Cenſorinus alſo teſtifies * that all aſtronomers after Ptolomey, if not before, had made uſe of the *ſame* table of dates as Cenſorinus himſelf; and his own date, united with that of Thucydides, proves that he himſelf made uſe of the very ſame table, as that of Ptolomey and Calviſius, namely of one, which reckoned only 337 years down to the 13th of Darius 2d. incluſively; but which Jackſon's pretendedly *true account* makes 339 years, on account of his carrying downward below Darius the 2 years interpolated higher up during the Jewiſh captivity. (Vol. 1. p. 354.)

rationem inveſtigavimus in libro de doctrina temporum; obſervavimus enim Canonem quendam imperatorum ac principum a Ptolomæo eſſe confectum, qui in fine eſt editus, inſcribitur que Κανων Βασιλειων; in eo Romanorum principum anni deinceps a Caligula *mendoſe* deſcripti ſunt, ſic ut anno *uno minus* putetur: hunc ergo Canonem Ptolomeus ſecutus in annis imperatorum unius anni errore lapſus eſt. *Petavius, Ration. Temp.* p. 2. lib. 4. c. 6.

* Ut a noſtris, ita ab Ægyptiis quidam anni in literas relati ſunt, quos Nabonaſſarou nominant, *quorum* hic [annus] 986tus cap. 21.

Upon

Upon this great difference then between the credit and coherency of the authors in favour of the one table of reigns, and the incoherency of thoſe in favour of the other, I might perhaps with ſufficient confidence reſt the preference of the above table of Calviſius, over that of Syncellus. On the ſide of the latter we have only Joſephus in part, but this very part is proved even by himſelf erroneous in another work †; and yet theſe errors were adopted afterwards by the chriſtian chronologer Africanus, of whoſe inaccuracy I have already given a ſufficient ſpecimen; and the ſame errors were taken up again by Syncellus, and other obſcure chriſtian chronologers, in an ignorant age; yet on account of their eccleſiaſtic authority were in part adhered to by Petavius, and lately defended by Jackſon: on the other ſide we have the teſtimony of the accurate Thucydides, who wrote of events, to which he was witneſs, with the dates of them as affixed by his co-temporaries, and theſe confirmed 550 years afterwards by an eminent aſtronomer Ptolomey, received by all ſucceeding aſtronomers

† Contra Appion. lib. 1. wherein he quotes a portion of the Babylonian hiſtory by Beroſus, in which the ſums of reign attributed to Nebuchadnezzar and his ſucceſſors differ from the ſums aſſigned in his Jewiſh Hiſtory.

without

without diſpute, confirmed by Cenſorinus 100 years later, and delivered down in different manuſcripts; which all agree with each other, and with the dates of Theon in his aſtronomy 100 years ſtill later. However, that I may not leave the leaſt room for doubt, I ſhall now proceed one ſtep farther, and prove alſo that aſtronomers *before* Ptolomey as well as *after* had made uſe, not only of the Chaldæan æra in general, but of this very ſame table of it as given above by Calviſius, and among theſe particularly Hipparchus 250 years before Ptolomey. Dodwell indeed had affirmed the ſame long ago, and Vignoles has endeavoured to prove it; but Dodwell had annexed no proof of his aſſertion, and thoſe which Vignoles has ſupplied, are not ſatisfactory; therefore ſince this fact has never hitherto been clearly eſtabliſhed, it may be proper to examine it thoroughly in theſe reſearches.

The Chaldæan æra and liſt of reigns at Babylon beginning the 1ſt year of Nabonaſſar has been commonly known among the moderns by the name of Ptolomey's Canon; from which title, though given to it perhaps by mere accident, Jackſon and others have drawn concluſions againſt its being of higher antiquity than Ptolomey himſelf about 450 years after the end of the æra, and pretended that it was compiled by him: but it does not appear,

pear, that it was ever known by that name among the antients; Cenſorinus calls it the Æra of Nabonaſſar. Petavius indeed has prefixed to his edition of it the title of Πτολομαιου Κανων, but that of Calviſius has no ſuch title; and if Petavius, who was prejudiced againſt it, has not been unfaithful here, yet the title may imply no more, than that it is the table, of which Ptolomey made uſe: and in fact Ptolomey's own words will ſupply us with proof, that at leaſt Hipparchus about 180 years after the end of the æra had made uſe of the ſame, if not Timocharis alſo within 40 years after Alexander's death, at which event the æra ends. Dodwell had aſſerted this before *, but at the ſame time with ſtrange inconſiſtency he made a ſecond aſſertion; namely that Hipparchus had not made uſe of the æra of Philip, which begins where the Chaldæan æra ends; and that wherever Ptolomey mentions any obſervations by Hipparchus dated by the æra of Philip, ſuch dates are to be attributed to Ptolomey himſelf, for that Hipparchus had dated his own obſervations only by the correſpondent years of the Greek Callipic period †. Now the inſolidity of this ſecond aſ-

* Append. ad Cyprian. Diſſert. f. 27.

† Ipſe Hipparchus periodi Calippeæ numeris *ſuas* deſignat obſervationes, ut proinde, ſi quando notetur annus ab Alexandro, Ptolomæo tamen potius nota illa, quam Hipparcho, tribuenda videtur. Dr. f. 29.

ſertion

ſertion of Dodwell it is neceſſary to diſprove, in order the better to eſtabliſh the ſolidity of his firſt; of which he himſelf has annexed no proofs; and Vignoles has accordingly ſufficiently diſproved the ſecond aſſertion *, yet without obſerving, that this ſtep would be any way inſtrumental to aſcertain the firſt. For inſtance in the following paſſage (as Vignoles has obſerved) the words of Ptolomey expreſsly attribute to Hipparchus himſelf the date by the æra of Alexander's death. Αναγραφει τοινυν ο Ιππαρχος εν Ροδω τετηρηκεναι δια των οργανων τονδε ηλιον και την σεληνην τω ρϟζ ει απο της Αλεξανδρου τελευτης, κατ' Αιγυπτιους Φαρμουθι ια, ωρας β αρχομενης, και ΦΗΣΙΝ οτι, &c. Mag. Conſtr. lib. 5. c. 5. Now the words αναγραφει and φησιν, which begin and conclude the ſentence neceſſarily refer all the intermediate words to Hipparchus himſelf, and conſequently the date by the æra of Philip and unintercalated year of the Egyptians, as well as the date by the Egyptian month and day. That this was alſo intended by Ptolomey appears evidently ſoon after, where he thus ſubjoins his own correſpondent date of this obſervation by the æra of Nabonaſſar, which he had repeatedly uſed before, συναγεται ο απο της εποχης ΗΜΩΝ μεχρι της τηρησεως χρονος ετων Αιγυπτιακων χκ και ημερων σιδ.

* Chronol. ſacr. vol. 2. lib. 5. c. 2. ſect. 3.

—Another proof of the ſame fact occurs in the following words of the ſame chapter. Ειληφαμεν παλιν εκ των υπο Ιππαρχου τετηρημενων, ως εφαμεν εν Ροδω, διαστασεων, την διωπλευμενην τω αυλω ριζ ειει απο της Αλεξανδρου τελευτης κατ' Αιγυπτιους Παυνι ιζ, &c. Here again the date of Ptolomey himſelf follows ſoon after. Γινεται ὁ απο της εποχης ΗΜΩΝ ετων χκ και ἡμερων πς. Theſe two examples clearly prove, that Hipparchus himſelf dated his obſervations by the æra of Philip: and hence Vignoles has juſtly concluded, that when in other quotations from Hipparchus we find annexed a double date, namely one by the Greek Callippic period, and a ſecond by the Egyptian æra of Philip; yet that the latter as well as the former are both to be aſcribed to Hipparchus; although the ambiguity of Ptolomey's expreſſion might otherwiſe in ſome caſes leave it doubtful, whether the latter might not be the date of Ptolomey himſelf. But Vignoles might have juſtly carried his concluſion ſtill farther, and aſſerted, that whenever any obſervation made uſe of by Hipparchus and quoted by Ptolomey is dated *only* by the year of ſome Greek Callippic period; yet if it be deſcribed by an Egyptian moveable month and day of that month, Hipparchus muſt have certainly dated it alſo by the æra of Philip, although Ptolomey has happened

pened not to take any notice of the lattet date: for the time of the obſervation would not have been fixed with any preciſion, if deſcribed by the day of an Egyptian moveable month, unleſs the Egyptian moveable year had been added alſo; it being a work of ſome difficulty to find out the day of any Callippic year, which correſponds to a given day of any Egyptian month in that year: at leaſt there can not poſſibly be any good reaſon, why Hipparchus ſhould *in all caſes* deſcribe both his own obſervations and thoſe of others by Egyptian months and days, unleſs he had alſo *in all caſes* dated them by Egyptian years, as I have proved that he certainly did in ſome caſes. In the following example he dates by both the Greek æra and Egyptian æra, which gives a preſumption at leaſt that he did ſo in other caſes. Παλιν ὁ μεν Ιππαρχος φησι την εν τω λβ ἐιει της γ καλα Καλλιππον περιοδου, εαρινην ισημεριαν γεγονεναι τη κζ του Μεχιρ πρωϊας, και εσλι το ἐλος το ρον απο της Αλεξανδρου τελευλης, &c. Now as Hipparchus here uſes the Egyptian month and day, the latter date by the Egyptian year muſt neceſſarily be aſcribed to him as well as the former by the Greek year; and even although Ptolomey had omitted the latter date, yet we muſt neceſſarily have ſuppoſed, that Hipparchus himſelf had inſerted it; as we here accordingly find that he did in

this inſtance, and in many other examples of the like kind, even in this ſame chapter (lib. 3. c. 1.): when therefore we meet with other inſtances in Ptolomey, and even in this ſame chapter, where he has not quoted from Hipparchus the Egyptian year of the obſervation, but *only* the day of the Egyptian month and the correſpondent Greek year, we cannot from hence conclude that Hipparchus himſelf had not added the Egyptian year alſo, but only that Ptolomey has omitted to quote it. Thus he ſays, Τω μγ εἰει [της τριτης κατα Καλιππον περιοδου] του μεχιρ τη κδ γενεσθαι φησι την εαρινην ισημεριαν, &c. φησι refers to Hipparchus before-mentioned, yet this and ſeveral other obſervations are *only* dated by the Greek year, although they are deſcribed by the day of an Egyptian month; we muſt therefore conclude, that Ptolomey has omitted the Egyptian year, and only annexed the correſpondent Greek year; but that Hipparchus himſelf had here alſo inſerted *both*, as well as in the foregoing example.

But we may juſtly carry on this reaſoning ſtill farther, and affirm concerning *all* paſſages whatever in Ptolomey, wherein he quotes any obſervations made uſe of by Hipparchus, which are deſcribed by the day and month of the Egyptians; that theſe likewiſe were *all* dated by an unintercalated year like the Egyp-

tian

tian, either by thoſe perſons who at firſt made the obſervations in queſtion, or elſe by Hipparchus, who afterwards made uſe of them and ſo deſcribed them, as quoted by Ptolomey. Thus in regard to an obſervation by Meto and Euctemon made in Greece Ptolomey ſays in the ſame chapter, Εκεινη μεν αναγραφεται γεγενημενη επι Αψευδους αρχοντος Αθηνησι, κατ' Αιγυπτιους φαμενωθ κα—και εστι τα μεν απο της επι του Αψευδους αναγεγραμμενης θερινης τροπης, μεχρι υπο των περι Αρισταρχον τετερημενης τω ν ετει της πρωτης κατα Καλλιππον περιοδου, καθως και ὁ Ιππαρχος φησιν, ετη ρνβ. Now ſince the obſervation here attributed to Meto, although dated by the year of an Athenian Archon, is nevertheleſs deſcribed by an Egyptian month and day; it is evident, that this is not the original deſcription, as it came out of the hands of Meto, who doubtleſs had deſcribed it *only* or at leaſt *alſo* by an Athenian month and day: the word αναγραφεται therefore muſt refer to the deſcription, which either Hipparchus, or ſome other perſon before him, had given of this obſervation, and who had reduced it from its Greek form to a correſpondent Egyptian form and date: although then Ptolomey happens to quote *only* its date by the Greek year, yet in that deſcription whence he took theſe words, it muſt have been dated *alſo* by the Egyptian year, otherwiſe

wiſe it would never have been deſcribed by an Egyptian month. Accordingly we ſhall find, that the 152 years there reckoned up after this obſervation down to the time of Ariſtarchus are not Greek years but Egyptian i. e. unintercalated years. So in like manner, although the obſervation of Ariſtarchus there mentioned is *only* dated in Ptolomey by a Greek Callippic year, and not even deſcribed by an Egyptian Month; yet Ptolomey muſt have found this alſo dated both by an Egyptian year and month, otherwiſe he would never have ſaid that Hipparchus reckoned up the diſtance between the two obſervations to be 152 Egyptian years; for that theſe are Egyptian, and not Greek years, appears ſufficiently from theſe next words, τα δε απο του προκειμενου ν ετους, ὁ ην καλα το μδ ελος απο της Αλεξανδρου τελευτης μεχρι του υξγ ἑλους, του καλα την ἡμετεραν τηρησιν, ἑλη υιδ· εν τοις μεταξυ αρα της ὁλης διασλασεως φοα ἑλεσιν, &c. Here we find, "that Ptolomey places the obſervation of Ariſtarchus in the 44th year of the Egyptian æra of Philip, and that from thence to the year of his own obſervation in the 463d year of Philip incluſively were 419 years; therefore in the whole diſtance from the obſervation of Meto under Apſeudes were (he ſays) 571 years." Now we can never ſuppoſe, that Ptolomey would unite in this ſum total two ſuch

ſuch diſſimilar years as Greek and Egyptian; the 419 were certainly Egyptian years, reckoned by the æra of Philip, therefore we may conclude, that the preceding 152 reckoned up by Hipparchus were Egyptian years alſo; conſequently the obſervation of Meto had been deſcribed by Hipparchus by the date of an Egyptian unintercalated year, as well as by the Greek date of the Archonſhip of Apſeudes: moreover in the very next ſubſequent line Ptolomey expreſsly calls them Egyptian years (Αιγυπτιακοις ετεσιν). Hence it is plain in general that Hipparchus not only dated by Egyptian years the obſervations made by himſelf and others *after* the commencement of the æra of Philip; but even thoſe alſo, which had been made *before* that æra, and made even in Greece, where Egyptian years and months were not in uſe; for of thoſe 152 years the laſt 44 only were after the end of the Chaldæan æra; Hipparchus muſt therefore have either reduced thoſe prior obſervations to the Egyptian form, or have received them ſo from other aſtronomers in Egypt before his own days, ſuch as Timocharis, * Ariſtyllus, Ariſtarchus † and others, who flou-

* Αναγραφει Τιμοχαρις τω ιγ ετει φιλαδελφου. lib. 10. 4.

† Biographers have been at a loſs to determine when Ariſtarchus of Samos lived: they have omitted to obſerve that this paſſage in Ptolomey fixes him about the 44th year of Philip.

riſhed ſoon after Alexander's death: the firſt of whom at leaſt made his obſervations in Egypt at Alexandria, and deſcribed them in like manner by Egyptian months and years as well as by Grecian months and years; a proof of which is ſubjoined ‡. Since then Hipparchus made uſe of obſervations made before the æra of Philip commenced, and dated them like thoſe after that æra, by Egyptian (or Chaldæan) years; he muſt have either reckoned theſe years in his own mind upward from the death of Alexander, or elſe have reckoned downward by ſome table of reigns (ſuch as the above Chaldæan one) which ends at the death of Alexander, and employs ſuch unintercalated years; this affords a ſtrong preſumption

‡ Τιμοχαρις μεν αναγραφει τηρησας εν Αλεξανδρεια ταυλα, διοτι τω μζ ειλει της πρωϊης κατα Καλλιππον περιοδου τη η τυ Αυθεσηριωνος, κατ' Αιγυπλιους τη κθ τυ Αθυρ, 7. 3. Ptolomey does not indeed quote the Egyptian year, but the deſcription by an Egyptian month ſhews, that Timocharis himſelf had annexed it. When therefore Ptolomey adds, και εσλιν ὀχρονος κατα το υξε ειος απο Ναβονασαρου, it becomes a doubt whether theſe words are not to be attributed to Timocharis alſo rather than to Ptolomey; and thus Timocharis would have uſed the Chaldæan æra within 40 years after the end of it; but however this may be, yet that Timocharis had inſerted the Egyptian year, although omitted by Ptolomey, appears alſo from a former note; where we ſaw, that Timocharis dated an obſervation by the 13th year of Philadelphus, that is, his 13th, according to the reckoning in the æra of Philip, for Ptolomey adds the correſpondent

tion at leaſt, that he had the Chaldæan table of reigns before him; and we ſhall find this preſumption confirmed by other paſſages without room for doubt. Vignoles has produced two; but theſe no way come up to the neceſſary proof: however there are others in Ptolomey which are very ſufficient. Dodwell had aſſerted the ſame before, but produced no proof of it; thoſe of Vignoles are inſufficient*, becauſe the dates may juſt as well be aſcribed to Ptolomey as to Hipparchus; no perſon has therefore hitherto produced any deciſive proof of this fact.

Now Ptolomey mentioning two antient eclipſes, ſays concerning one of them Δευτερα δε, ἣ και Ιππαρχος συνεχρησαλο, γενομενη τω κ

dent date from Nabonaſſar. The double date however of this obſervation may as probably be aſcribed to Hipparchus alſo, as thoſe in all the foregoing ones; for it ſeems to appear, that Hipparchus had made a collection of all the obſervations by different aſtronomers, and deſcribed them by their correſpondent dates in the years and months of different nations: It is therefore to this catalogue, that Ptolomey ſo often refers by the word *αναγραφεται*. Utriuſque ſideris curſum in ſexcentos annos præcinuit Hipparchus, menſes *gentium* dieſque et horas—complexus. (Plin. Hiſt. 2. 12.) As Hipparchus had thus predicted Eclipſes for 600 years, and deſcribed them by the days and months of different nations; ſo the above extracts by Ptolomey ſeem to confirm, that Hipparchus had done the ſame by eclipſes which were paſt, and collected from other aſtronomers.

* Chron. Sacr. lib. 5. c. 3.

ἐλει Δαρειου του μελα Καμβυσου, καὶ Αιγυπτιους Επιφι κη, &c. *lib.* 4. *c. ult.* This paſſage at leaſt proves that Hipparchus made uſe of other eclipſes obſerved before the æra of Philip, beſides thoſe obſerved in Greece: and although the date here by the Egyptian month and Chaldæan year may at firſt ſeem as probably to be aſcribed to Ptolomey as to Hipparchus; yet we ſhall ſee from other inſtances, that they ought both to be aſcribed to Hipparchus himſelf; and therefore elſewhere in ſuch ambiguous paſſages as this, it is not to be concluded, that both dates are not to be aſcribed to Hipparchus, becauſe Ptolomey uſes ſuch a phraſe as leaves it in doubt. In the following chapter Ptolomey begins with obſerving, that there is ſome little difference between a concluſion of Hipparchus and his own: he then proceeds to point out the cauſe of it, in the examples of three eclipſes, " which Hipparchus, (as he ſays) had ſelected out of thoſe ſent from Babylon and obſerved there," ταυτας μεν δη τας τρεις εκλειψεις παρατεθεισθαι, ΦΗΣΙΝ, απο των εκ Βαβυλωνος διακομισθεισων, ὡς εκει τετηρημενας· γεγονεναι δε την πρωτην αρχοντος Αθηνησι Φανοστρατου, μηνος Ποσειδεωνος—γινεσθαι τοινυν ὁ χρονος κατα το τξς ἐτος απο Ναβοναζαρου, καὶ Αιγυπτιους, ὡς ΑΥΤΟΣ ΦΗΣΙ Θωθ κς, &c. Now the words ὡς αυτος φησι plainly determine, that Hipparchus had fixed the time of the firſt

firſt of theſe three eclipſes by an Egyptian month and day. But can any one pretend to ſay, that the date by the year of Nabonaſar is not in like manner to be attributed to Hipparchus as well as the date by the Egyptian month? It is certain at leaſt (as I contended before) that he muſt have dated by an unintercalated year, like that employed in the æra of Nabonaſar, ſince he dated by moveable Egyptian months: and moreover I have pointed out an inſtance in a quotation from Ptolomey at p. 163 where it is in like manner left doubtful, whether the date by the æra of Alexander's death was to be attributed to Ptolomey or Hipparchus, and yet by other paſſages, which were not left ſo ambiguous, it was proved to belong to Hipparchus: the ſame is probably the caſe in the preſent paſſage concerning the Chaldæan æra; and it will appear even certain from the following conſiderations. Ptolomey's object in this chapter is to point out the cauſe of a diſagreement between Hipparchus and himſelf: which he proves to have ariſen from Hipparchus's *not having reckoned up the time preciſely between the firſt and ſecond and between the ſecond and third eclipſe*, (φαινεται ουν εν τοις των διαστασεων επιλογισμοις διεψευμενος, &c.) Hence we learn what his motive was for inſerting the words ὡς αυλος φησι before the Egyptian month, and day of that month,

on which he fixed the firſt eclipſe, namely, not to diſtinguiſh as if the ſubſequent date by the Egyptian month belonged to Hipparchus, and the preceding date by the year of Nabonaſar to Ptolomey himſelf; but (whether they both belonged to Hipparchus or not) to make the reader remark, that he quoted accurately the Egyptian month and day of the eclipſe as fixed by Hipparchus himſelf; and thereby to prove, that Hipparchus had not computed accurately the diſtance of time between the 1ſt eclipſe and the 2d; which remark once made being ſufficient, the words ὡς αὐλος φησι are omitted in the ſame ſituation in Hipparchus's deſcription of the two following eclipſes. But to us theſe words accidentally ſerve for a different purpoſe from what was intended by Ptolomey; for they ſerve to prove, that Hipparchus himſelf had deſcribed this eclipſe and the two following ones by Egyptian months: now ſince this was not the motive for thoſe words being placed there, it follows, that no contradiſtinction could be intended by Ptolomey between the date by the year of Nabonaſar, and the date by the Egyptian month, as if the latter was to be aſcribed to Hipparchus, but not the former, as ſome authors underſtand theſe words to mean, and among others Mr. Coſtard in his Hiſtory of Aſtronomy, p. 124. Jackſon has ſomewhere ſtrained ſuch phraſes

phraſes in Ptolomey to a different contradiſtinction, as if he had meant by adding κατ' Αιγυπτιους to denote, that Egyptian years and months differed from Chaldæan ones in duration as well as in name; others have thought that he meant only that their names differed: whereas it is clear, that not any one of theſe meanings can be attached to Ptolomey's above-mentioned phraſe: κατ' Αιγυπτιους is uniformly throughout inſerted for no other purpoſe, than to diſtinguiſh Grecian years and months from Egyptian years and months; accordingly we ſee in this preſent example, and may in ſeveral others, that obſervations were frequently dated by Hipparchus agreeably to both calendars, and not only his own obſervations, but alſo thoſe made at Babylon *. Timocharis, as I have ſhewn, had done the ſame. Upon the whole, every thing conſpires to prove, that we ought to underſtand the date here by the year of the Chaldæan æra to

* Mr. Coſtard (who quotes this paſſage for a different purpoſe from myſelf) has moreover called this eclipſe under Phanoſtratus "the *firſt* lunar eclipſe brought from Babylon;" but πρωτη refers only to the *firſt* of three eclipſes under conſideration: in fact this and the other two were the *laſt* eclipſes obſerved at Babylon, being in the 366th and 367th year of Nabonaſar. Again he ſays, "no eclipſes are recorded in Ptolomey as obſerved at Babylon later than Darius Hyſtaſpis;" and yet the above three in queſtion were above 100 years afterwards.

belong

belong to Hipparchus, as well as that by the Egyptian month: but at worſt, ſince the error attributed to Hipparchus by Ptolomey is only of a ſmall part of an hour, we may conclude at leaſt, that Ptolomey found no difference in regard to the year of the obſervation between his own and Hipparchus's date; and by whatever æra it was, it muſt have been by a year not intercalated.

But laſtly, another paſſage ſeems to put it out of all doubt, that Hipparchus himſelf employed the Chaldæan æra in all theſe obſervations previous to the æra of Philip. In lib. 4. c. 5. Ptolomey ſays, "that he ſhall follow the ſame methods of demonſtration as Hipparchus, for like him taking three eclipſes of the moon, he ſhall prove, &c. *" Accordingly in the following chapter he tells us which thoſe three eclipſes are, beginning in theſe words, Ὧν τοινυν ειληφαμεν παλαιων τριων εκλειψεων, εκ των εν Βαβυλωνι τετηρημενων, ἡ μεν πρωτη αναγεγραπται γεγονυια τω πρωτῳ ἐτει Μαρδοκεμπαδου, κατ' Αιγυπτιους Θωθ κδ εις την λ' ηρξατο δε, ΦΗΣΙΝ, εκλειπειν, &c. Now the word αναγεγραπται cannot be referred to any other perſon than Hipparchus, as the word φησιν, which follows, again

* Ακολουθησομεν ταις τε θεωρηματος εφοδοις, αις και τον Ιππαρχον ὁρωμεν συνχεχρημενον, λαμβανουσες γαρ και αυτοι τριις εκλειψεις σεληνιακας, δειξομεν, &c.

con-

confirms: the very ſame words occur in the account of the two remaining eclipſes, both of which were in the ſecond year of Mardokempadus: Αναγεγραπται cannot be referred to the original anonymous obſerver of theſe eclipſes in Babylon; which in the very beginning of this chapter he had called αρχαιολαων, and of which he ſaid *he likewiſe* ſhould uſe three quæ indubitate videntur deſcriptæ (αδιστακτως δοκουσαις αναγεγραφθαι συγχρησαμενοι); for as theſe eclipſes are deſcribed by the name of an Egyptian month, the deſcription muſt refer to ſome Aſtronomer in times later than the firſt obſerver; and this can be no other than Hipparchus, as he alone has been mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, and is referred to in the reſt by συγχρησαμενοι. Here then we find, that Hipparchus himſelf had dated theſe antient eclipſes by the Chaldæan æra; for they are all three dated in the firſt and ſecond year of Mardokempadus: the collected years indeed of theſe eclipſes reckoned from the firſt of Nabonaſar are not added here by Hipparchus; but this is not neceſſary in order to aſcertain that theſe eclipſes are dated by the Chaldæan æra, for the collected years may not perhaps have been reckoned up in the original Chaldæan æra, but added afterwards by Egyptian Aſtronomers; and the original may have only

marked

marked the ſucceſſion of Kings and the number of years in the reign of each; the number of collected years from the firſt is only a conſequence neceſſarily reſulting from the number of years attributed to each King †. Ptolomey himſelf however proceeds in the next chapter but one (the 7th) to give us the number of collected years between all theſe eclipſes and the firſt of Nabonaſar, which are the very ſame numbers as in the above Chaldæan table; a certain proof that he had found no difference here between the dates of Hipparchus and himſelf in regard to the years of obſervation, otherwiſe he could have never with truth called theſe eclipſes *indubitate deſcriptæ*. It ſeems certain then, that, in determining the time of eclipſes before the æra of Philip, Hipparchus did not date them upward by the number of years before that æra but downward by the years of reign of that Chaldæan King, in which they happened; and that both in this and the preceding example Ptolomey found thoſe years to be the very ſame number of collected years from Na-

† I have ſhewn in a note above, that ſo late as the æra of Philip Timocharis in like manner dated an obſervation by the 13th year of Philadelphus, not by the collected year of the æra of Philip, formed by reckoning up the ſums of the preceding reigns in that æra down to the 13th of Ptolomey Philadelphus.

bonaſar as is given us in the above Chaldæan table of reigns: now the latter of the two foregoing examples being before the Jewiſh captivity, and the former one after it, and alſo later than the 13th of Darius ſo accurately fixed by Thucydides, we have therefore the greater reaſon to believe, that there is no error in the Chaldæan table *during* the captivity any more than either *above* or *below* it; at leaſt we are certain, that any ſuch error cannot extend upward above the fifth of Nabopolaſſar, although Uſher carries it farther back; nor downwards lower than the 7th of Cambyſes, although Jackſon carries it down below the above eclipſes in the 367th Chaldæan year.

During the period between the abovementioned dates, of which the Jewiſh captivity forms the greater part, it has unfortunately happened, that Ptolomey found no occaſion to make uſe of any eclipſes, which probably had been obſerved then and recorded by the Babylonians as well as during other periods before and after: this prevents us from being able to draw any proofs from him in confirmation of the accuracy of the above table during that particular ſpace of time; and thereby the better opportunity has been afforded to antient as well as modern chriſtian chronologers to alter and vary the ſeveral Sums of reign aſſigned to theſe intermediate kings agreeably to their own con-

jectures. Accordingly Syncellus acknowledges, that even in his time, ſome particular reigns of the Chaldæn æra differed in different copies in regard to their ſums, although all copies agreed in the ſum total *: And on comparing his two copies with the table it appears, that they differ chiefly during the Jewiſh captivity and in thoſe reigns immediately contiguous to it; a ſufficient proof, that ſuch diſagreements had ariſen from a like practice among the antient chriſtian chronologers as among the moderns, of tampering with thoſe dates, by ſhortning or ſtretching them out in order to ſuit with their own ſuppoſitions. But fortunately, although Ptolomey fails us here, yet a ſubſidiary proof is afforded us by Joſephus of the accuracy of the above Chaldæan table during the captivity likewiſe: for he quotes from Beroſus's Hiſtory of Babylon, a minute relation of Chaldæan tranſactions during this period of the captivity; in which he agrees with the above table in the ſums of reign allotted to each Babylonian king †.

Yet

* See p. 147.

† Ναβυκολασαρος—ἐτη εικοσι ἐν.—Ναβυχοδονοσορος—βεβασιλευκως ἐτη τεσσαρακοντα τρια.—Ευιλμαραδουχος—βασιλευσας ἐτη δυο.—Νηριγλισσορος εβασιλευσεν ἐτη τεσσαρα.—Λαβορροσαρχοδος μηνας εννεα.—Ουσης δε της Βασιλειας Ναβοννηδε εν τω επτα και δεκατω ετει—Κυρος ωρμησεν επι της Βαβυλωνιας. *Joſeph.*

Yet through a ſtrange fatality in reaſoning, from this very ſame relation modern chronologers have drawn two contrary concluſions; for Petavius as before mentioned, rejected the above Chaldæan table, becauſe (as he pretended) it *did not* agree with this relation from Beroſus ſo well as Syncellus's copies *; while on the contrary Dodwell and Vignoles have deprived this table of its juſt claim to higher antiquity, and ſuppoſed it to have been compiled from the Hiſtory of Beroſus, or by that hiſtorian himſelf, for this very reaſon, becauſe it *did* agree with him in every date †: thus its friends, as well as enemies, though from this relation they have drawn different concluſions, have nevertheleſs neither of them drawn ſuch, as are either ſo favourable or juſt as the ſtate of the caſe permits.

That the concluſion of Petavius is not juſt appears by the preceding quotation itſelf from

ſeph. contra Appion. lib. 1. In the 1ſt reign the preſent MSS. have εικοσιεννεα, which is doubtleſs an error for εικοσι εν; for in his Hiſtory lib. 10. c. 11. Joſephus again quotes the firſt part of this paſſage, and expreſsly from Beroſus; but there the text has εικοσι εν.

* See p. 156.

† "Dodwell attributes to Beroſus the firſt part of the canon of Ptolomey, and I embrace his conjecture, until ſomebody ſuggeſts any thing more plauſible." *Chron. Sacr. lib.* 5. c. 2. ſect. 3.—Dodwell's Cyprian. Diſſert. Append. ſect. 22

Beroſus: for the ſums of all the reigns there during the ſucceſſors of Nebuchadnezzar agree exactly to the above table; the only apparent difference is in the 9 months attributed to Laboroſoarchod, and this is a diſagreement in appearance only. Petavius, Uſher and Jackſon have ſuppoſed, that theſe 9 months, and many other odd months are altogether omitted in the Chaldæan æra; but this is an erroneous ſuppoſition, and carries falſhood upon the very face of it; for what can we think of Ptolomey as an aſtronomer, if he pretended to reckon up the diſtance between different antient eclipſes, and ſome in his own time to a day and an hour; while he reckoned by an æra of dates, in which whole months were ſometimes omitted, and almoſt whole years at once. Petavius moreover happening to publiſh his *Doctrina Temporum* within a few years after the firſt publication of the true Chaldæan æra by Calviſius, the learned had not then conſidered what the real method of reckoning in that æra was; Petavius therefore ſeeing five years allowed to Nerigliſſar in the copy of Syncellus, and only four in that of Calviſius, without any mention of the 9 months of Laboroſoarchod in either, concluded theſe odd months in Beroſus to be altogether omitted in the latter table; but in the former to be included in thoſe five

years

years of his predeceſſor. In this however he was miſtaken, and it will be proved, that all odd months may juſt as often be included in the firſt year of the ſucceſſor, as in the laſt of the predeceſſor: neither can there be any omiſſion, ſince it is now agreed, and may be proved from Ptolomey, that every year in the Chaldæan æra is a complete year beginning and ending at the firſt and laſt day of the Chaldæan year: ſome have ſuppoſed however (although erroneouſly) that the laſt year of every king ends at the Chaldæan new year's day next *after* his deceaſe; but it has been ſhewn by others that the real method of reckoning employed in this æra is, for every ſuch laſt year to end at the Chaldæan new year's day next *before* every king's death; by which means the 9 months of Laboroſoarchod would be included in the 1ſt of Nabonadius his ſucceſſor, and the greater part of this 1ſt year being thus deducted from his 17, there remain only 16 real years of his own in the table. Now in conſequence of this being the right method of reckoning, if Nabonadius reigned any odd months after that complete year marked as his nominal 17th, but which was only his 16th real year, they would be included in the 1ſt of his ſucceſſor Cyrus: every king therefore in the æra entered into a year of reign more than that which is marked as his laſt in the

the table; Nabonadius then entered into his 18th nominal year by the table, which on account of the 9 months of his predeceſſor being included in his firſt year, was but his 17th real year. Accordingly Beroſus has accurately ſaid, that Cyrus over-ran Babylonia and dethroned Nabonadius in his 17th year (εν τω ἑπταικαι δεκατῳ ἐτει); and he muſt mean his 17th *real* year, becauſe he had before deducted or ſeparated the 9 months of Laboroſoarchod from the beginning of the *nominal* reign of Nabonadius in the Chaldæan table. When therefore this right method of reckoning employed in the Chaldæan table is thus applied to this paſſage of Beroſus, it appears that there is not the leaſt real difference between them in the ſum of theſe 3 reigns; but only an apparent difference cauſed by modern readers themſelves, who from their not attending to the nature of the Chaldæan æra have been apt erroneouſly to reckon up twice the 9 months of Laboroſoarchod, once by themſelves, and a ſecond time included in the firſt nominal year of his ſucceſſor, or the laſt of his predeceſſor; an error which Beroſus himſelf had avoided, by ſeparating in this caſe the *nominal* years of the table into the *real* ſums belonging to each of theſe two kings.

It is obſervable moreover, that although Joſephus quotes this paſſage of Beroſus in his reply

reply to the cenſures of Apion againſt his Jewiſh Antiquities; yet in his Jewiſh Hiſtory itſelf, he gives different lengths to theſe reigns: for he gives 18 years to Evilmerodach, 40 years to Nerigliſſar, 9 months to Laboroſoarchod, and 17 years to Nabonadius, whom he calls Balthaſſar *; and nevertheleſs ſays, that the 1ſt of Cyrus was the 70th of the Jewiſh captivity †; whereas thoſe ſums amount to 76 already, without including the 25 years more of Nebuchadnezzar after his 18th, in which Joſephus places the deſtruction of the temple under Zedekiah; for from thence he ſuppoſes Jeremiah to date thoſe 70 years ‡. Now the 18th of Nebuchadnezzar being according to the table the 161ſt Chaldæan year, and the 1ſt of Cyrus being the 210th, the real diſtance between thoſe events was only 49 years inſtead of 70. This error then in Joſephus is ſo monſtrous and ſo totally unneceſſary to any purpoſe, that it has been ſuppoſed, there muſt be ſome miſtake in the text. Bengelius conjectures with ſome probability, that we ought to read 18 *months* inſtead of *years* §, which would come near to the true reign of Evilmerodach; but he might as juſtly have gone

* Lib. 10. 12.
† Lib. 11. 1. ad initium—Contr. App. lib. 1. ad medium.
‡ Lib. 10. 10 & 11.
§ Ordo Temporum. Stutg. 1770.

farther,

farther, and ſuppoſed alſo that we ought to read 4 years inſtead of 40 (a common error ariſing from antient contractions in MSS. whereby units are often converted into decads and decads into units) or elſe 40 *months* inſtead of *years*; which added to the 9 months of Laboroſoarchod would make 4 years and 1 month; and thus would agree to the true ſum of Nerigliſſar. Theſe 6 years added to the 25 of Nebuchadnezzar and the 17 of Nabonadius make 48 years; and as Joſephus places a Cyaxares the 2d. copied from Xenophon (whom he ſuppoſes the ſame as Darius Mede in Daniel) between Nabonadius and Cyrus, without determining the length of his reign, he might have conceived that the reign of this king was long enough to complete the 48 to 70 years; more eſpecially as he mentions a wonderful tower pretended to be built by this Cyaxares, and ſtill remaining in the hiſtorian's time *omni admiratione dignum*: But although his account would be a little mended by theſe ſuppoſitions, yet he would ſtill greatly exceed the truth. The chriſtian biſhop Euſebius, as I obſerved before, had made 70 years between the deſtruction of the temple and the 2d year of Darius, in which it began to be rebuilt; theſe were 5 years too many; however he had ſome apparent authority for it from ſcripture: but his Jewiſh predeceſſor Joſephus had, as

we

we ſee, made it 70 years from the ſame event to a much more early one, the acceſſion of Cyrus to Babylon, wherein he committed an error of 20 years *.

Scripture chronology then being thus corrupted at its very ſource by the moſt learned of the Jews themſelves, it is no wonder that the old chriſtian chronologers adopted ſome of their errors, or made others in attempting to rectify them: and although the moderns

* Some late editors of Joſephus have endeavoured to ſet aſide this cenſure, by altering his Greek text in one place merely by conjecture. In the middle of his firſt book againſt Appion he ſays, "that the temple laid in ruins 7 years (επι ἑβδομηκοντα)." Here is ſome manifeſt error in the text: Havercamp knowing, that the real time from that deſtruction to the acceſſion of Cyrus at Babylon, (to which only Joſephus reckoned, for he adds there, ſecundo anno regni Cyri fundamentis poſitis, rurſus ſecundo Darii perfectum eſt) was no more than fifty years, he has changed επτα into πεντηκοντα. Jackſon approves this as the true reading (vol. 1. 380) under pretence that Euſebius and Syncellus had found it *fifty* in their copies of Joſephus: but why might not Euſebius and Syncellus have made that emendation by conjecture as well as Havercamp? Joſephus himſelf certainly wrote ἑβδομηκοντα, which the contractions in MSS. afterwards changed into units, as is frequently the caſe; for a few ſentences before Joſephus has the ſame words, Civitatem contigit deſolari annis 70 uſq; ad Cyrum. Again in his hiſtory lib. 11. he begins thus, Primo anno Cyri, qui fuit tranſmigrationis noſtræ Babylonicæ 70^mus, he reckoned this only from the deſtruction of the temple, as appears from the ſubſequent words, ſicut Hieremias ante dirutam urbem predixerat.

have corrected the moſt conſpicuous of the errors of both, by having recourſe to prophane authors; yet they have ſtill retained ſome few leſſer ones, which are the chief cauſe of any confuſion that ſubſiſts at preſent; particularly they have retained 2 out of theſe 20 years of error in Joſephus, and which they ſtill attribute to this ſame Cyaxares the 2d a mere ſuppoſitious king in romance; and as the ſuppoſition of the moderns is built on no better foundation than that of Joſephus before, the fault is juſt the ſame, whether the error conſiſts of units or decads. This error in Joſephus I have more particularly exhibited, in order to preſent one proof, (many more of which may be collected from his hiſtory) that the moſt learned of the Jews at that time were totally unable to adjuſt the hiſtorical parts of their own ſcriptures, and therefore we can expect nothing but confuſion from them in regard to chronology. Hence however ariſes a good proof in favour of the authenticity of the books admitted into their ſacred canon; which if they had been tampered with by any Jewiſh doctors after the commencement of chriſtianity or even long before, would in courſe have partaken of their common vulgar errors.

Since then we find, that the Chaldæan æra agrees with Beroſus, although Joſephus himſelf

ſelf does not, and that the concluſion of Petavius is not juſt; we may conſider next the falſe concluſion, which Dodwell and Vignoles have drawn from this agreement, namely that the æra in queſtion was compiled by Beroſus or copied from his hiſtory*; whereas in itſelf it is equally probable, that Beroſus might copy from that æra; and on account of ſeveral other reaſons it is much more probable. For in the firſt place we have ſeen already how precarious it is to draw concluſions, that any thing did not exiſt before a certain time, only becauſe we happen to have no evidence preſerved prior to that time. Thus authors have ſaid that the æra of Philip did not exiſt before Ptolomey, only becauſe they conceived, that no author extant had mentioned it more early; nevertheleſs I have proved, that both Hip-

* Dodwell thinks Beroſus was the author of it. *Jackſ. Chron. Ant.* vol. 1. p. 436. Yet Dodwell himſelf ſays, Beroſum noſtri Canonis primum *editorem* fuiſſe diximus. This means no more, than that Beroſus was the firſt, who publiſhed it among the Greeks, and not the compiler. Dodwell then agrees with me: yet Vignoles underſtood Dodwell as Jackſon does; *Dodwell attribue a Beroſe ce Canon.* "The truth ſeems to be, that Ptolomey himſelf compoſed the whole canon [both the Chaldæan æra and that of Philip] and took the years from Nabonaſar to Alexander out of the Chaldæan hiſtory and probably that of Beroſus, and the remainder from the Egyptian annals and the Greek and Roman hiſtorians." *Jackſon*, p. 436, &c.

parchus and Timocharis had uſed it 3 and 400 years before Ptolomey: in like manner then we ought to be cautious how we draw haſty concluſions againſt the priority of the Chaldæan æra before Beroſus from the ſame dubious premiſes. Moreover other circumſtances rather prove its higher antiquity: for in the above quotation from Beroſus, we find that 5 out of the 6 kings have no odd months; which being no way probable, carries with it a ſtrong preſumption, that he found this method of comprizing all odd months in the firſt year of the ſucceſſor already eſtabliſhed in the Chaldæan materials, whence he drew his information; and therefore he did not chooſe to vary from it, except when abſolutely neceſſary, as in the caſe of ſo large a number as the 9 months of a ſeparate king Laboroſoarchod: ſtill farther, how can we conceive the aſtronomers at Babylon, 3 or 400 years before Alexander, able to have tranſmitted down the times of their obſervations, unleſs they had ſome æra by which to date them? They could not reckon them upwards like Hipparchus at p. 170, by the number of years before Alexander's death; they muſt have reckoned them downwards by the number after ſome prior epochs, which were in ſucceeding times connected with the death of Alexander; now as the Chaldæan æra preſents us with

ſuch

ſuch epochs, namely a long ſucceſſion of kings, whoſe names as well as actions were almoſt unknown either to the Greeks or Egyptians; and as we learn from Ptolomey, that Hipparchus had made uſe of aſtronomic obſervations dated by theſe epochs, ſuch as eclipſes in the 1ſt and 2d year of Mardocempadus; it muſt be prepoſterous to ſuppoſe them to have been thus dated only by other perſons, long after the original obſervers themſelves at Babylon. We know that they muſt have been dated by ſome æra; we find theſe obſervations dated by an æra of Chaldæan kings reigning at the capital, where the obſervations were made, of whoſe very names we have ſcarcely any knowledge except from theſe very obſervations; and ſhall we nevertheleſs make a wanton ſuppoſition that they were originally dated by ſome other method, and that this æra, by which we now find them dated, was compiled by Beroſus ſeveral hundred years afterwards? The ſuppoſition is of an incredible nature; and indeed the very idea of any ſingle perſon compiling a whole æra containing above 400 years, is ſo contrary to the common courſe of things, as to be no leſs incredible; for æras were doubtleſs compiled in antient times in the ſame manner as now, not at once by any ſingle perſon, but by the cotemporaries of every reign in ſucceſ-

ſion,

ſion, each year of it being added by degrees as it accrued, and the whole ſum of each reign being added by degrees to the foregoing ones. Every attorney's clerk in dating his deeds by the year of any reign may help to compile an æra; but what is ſo eaſy to a cotemporary, would become a difficult taſk even to an accurate hiſtorian 400 years afterwards; and would indeed be impoſſible, unleſs he had either equally accurate hiſtorians to copy after, or a numerous collection of original archives to conſult, neither of which were probably the caſe in that early period of humanity contained within the Chaldæan æra, when the knowledge of ſcience did but juſt begin to appear. Thucydides himſelf, one of the moſt accurate of the Greek writers in a much more cultivated age, would ſcarcely have been able to fix ſo preciſely the 13th of Darius a Perſian king, reckoned by a year ſo different from that of the Greeks, if he had not been a cotemporary to the tranſaction dated by it, and ſeen a true copy of the treaty of peace in queſtion: and we find other Greek authors in general ſo ill informed concerning Aſiatic dates even in reſpect to the Perſian kings of their own times, that they are continually contradicting each other. The uſe moreover of this moveable year in the Chaldæan æra becomes another proof of its priority

priority to Beroſus: we have indeed no clear information tranſmitted to us concerning the nature of the Chaldæan year from the antients; and only ſome conjectures made by moderns; but the above quotation from Beroſus ſeems to contain ſtronger evidence in favour of the Chaldæan year being like the Egyptian, than any which Jackſon or other writers have produced to the contrary; for as he wrote his hiſtory for the uſe of the Greeks in general, and not for the Egyptians, a ſingle ſtate in ſubjection to the Greeks, it is inconceivable, that he ſhould in any reſpect adjuſt his dates to the moveable Egyptian year unknown to the Greeks, if it had been different from the Chaldæan year; whereas the above quotation from Beroſus ſeems to contain plain traces of his having in the reigns of five ſucceſſive kings followed the Chaldæan ſums exactly as they were reckoned by the moveable year in the Chaldæan æra: conſequently he muſt have uſed the ſame method of avoiding odd months, and the two years muſt have been the ſame. Manetho on the contrary, who wrote the hiſtory of Egypt about the ſame time, where this moveable year, as we are certain, was in uſe, and alſo the ſame method of avoiding odd months, had nevertheleſs added to every reign the odd months as well as

ſum

ſum of years contained in it*; and Beroſus muſt have done the ſame, if he had not adhered to the method of the table. But if Beroſus had compiled this table and the Chaldæans had not uſed ſuch an unintercalated year as that employed in it, but one fixed to a determinate day, this æra would have ſtood in contradiction to his hiſtory by making his kings often commence near a twelve month before their real time in his hiſtory: one cannot in this caſe conceive any hiſtoric uſe, which Beroſus could propoſe in this table by thus deviating from the Chaldæan year; thoſe therefore who conſider Beroſus as the author or editor of this æra, muſt in courſe conſider the unintercalated year employed therein to be the real Chaldæan year; but this is in fact to acknowledge that the æra ſubſiſted before Beroſus, that he only copied it from the Chaldæan archives, and publiſhed it as a voucher for his own hiſtory. Thoſe again who conceive this æra to be only an abſtract taken by later authors from Beroſus, hereby at the ſame time prove, that in his hiſtory the kings commenced agreeably to the unintercalated year employed in this æra; which is

* See Joſephus's Extracts from Manetho, *lib.* 1. *Cont. App.* and thoſe in Theophilus ad Autolicum. Africanus, Euſebius and Syncellus have dropped all the odd months in their extracts from Manetho.

again

again to prove its originality, and that the Chaldæans had really uſed ſuch a year. If again it had been Hipparchus or any other aſtronomer in Egypt, who had transformed this æra into its preſent ſtate, by ſubſtituting Egyptian unintercalated years inſtead of the intercalated ones of the Chaldæan original, yet this could no more tend to any aſtronomic uſe, than ſuch a transformation by Beroſus to any hiſtoric one, but rather to confuſion in both caſes. For if aſtronomers wanted to date any Chaldæan obſervations by unintercalated years, ſuch as were uſed by them in Egypt, this would have been eaſily done by reckoning up the number of unintercalated years between any ſuch obſervation and the commencement of the æra of Philip, or of any particular year in it; as we have accordingly ſeen practiſed by Hipparchus at p. 168, in regard to a Greek obſervation, which he there fixes in the 1511ſt year before the 44th of Philip: there was no occaſion for any aſtronomer to have transformed every year of every king in the Chaldæan hiſtory into an Egyptian unintercalated year inſtead of an intercalated Chaldæan one for any purpoſe in aſtronomy. Nay ſuch a work would rather be productive of confuſion, whenever any Chaldæan obſervation happened to fall near the end of any

year in the Chaldæan original; for then it would be often tranſplaced into the beginning of the following year in the copy after the Egyptian form; as for inſtance the eclipſe quoted at p. 172 on the 26th day of the firſt Egyptian month Thoth, in the 366th year of the æra; this was the 23d year of Artaxerxes the 2d according to the preſent ſuppoſed Egyptian form of this æra: but if the Chaldæans had really uſed a year fixed by intercalation, this eclipſe would have happened above 2 months before the end of the 22d year of Artaxerxes according to their reckoning, as the Egyptian new year's day had then gone back from the 26th of February to the end of the preceding November; ſo that whoever ſhould refer it to the 23d year of that king would in this caſe refer it to a year of his reign, in which it did not really happen. Now all ſuch confuſion would have been avoided, if the years of every reign had not been thus transformed from fixed Chaldæan years to unintercalated Egyptian years; for then the eclipſe might have been always referred to the right year of Artaxerxes, and quoted as happening in the 22d year of his reign, and in the 59th Egyptian year before the commencement of the æra of Philip. The ſuppoſition

then, that any ſuch a pretended transformation of this æra from intercalated years to unintercalated ones might be made by Hipparchus for the uſe of aſtronomers, is no more juſt than it could be made for any good hiſtoric purpoſe by Beroſus. All theſe circumſtances then confirm, that this æra is ſtill in its original ſtate, as it came out of the hands of the Chaldæans: but even if it ſhould not; yet we ſee this transformation muſt have been made by a good hand, either by Hipparchus himſelf, or by ſome other before him, ſince both he and Ptolomey deſcribed eclipſes by the 1ſt and 2d year of Mardocempadus and dated them as in the preſent transformed copies, if they be transformed. Such a copy then is as much to be depended on as the Chaldæan original; and becomes a proof, that ſuch an original did exiſt in the time of Hipparchus. Finally, Syncellus gives us another proof, that ſuch an original did exiſt long before Beroſus; for he informs us, " that *Beroſus ſays* (who compiled the Chaldæan antiquities) and Alexander Polyhiſtor agreed with him in this, that Nabonaſar having collected the actions of his royal predeceſſors commanded, that the computation of the Chaldæan reigns ſhould be made from him: now

now there were the ſame number of years after Nabonaſar as is laid down in the canon of reigns, namely 424." * Nothing can be clearer, than that Beroſus himſelf here confeſſes this æra to be as old as Nabonaſar himſelf.

* Ως ὁ Αλεξανδρος [Πολυιστωρ] και Βηρωσσος φησιν (οἱ τας χαλδαικας αρχαιολογιας περιειληφοτες) Ναβονασαρος συναγαγων τας πραξεις των προ αυτου Βασιλεων, ηφανισεν, ὁπως απ' αυτου ἡ καταριθμησις γινεται των χαλδαιων Βασιλεων· εισεν ουν, ὡς προκειται εν Κανονιω, οἱ αυλοι απο Ναβονασαρου χρονοι υκδ. P. 207.

Ηφανισεν means, that Nabonaſar *deſtroyed the preceding archives:* Critics have doubted the truth of this fact. It may be an erroneous reading for εφανισαν, *manifeſtavit, edixit*; thus at leaſt Marſham has tranſlated the paſſage.

FINIS.

ERRATA AND CORRECTIONS.

In page 69, line 3, for *ninety years before Solon*, read 68 *years before the 55th Olympiad, at which time Solon returned from his ten years travels through Asia; whence he possibly brought the first complete set of Homer's poems; at least he was the first, who is recorded to be an admirer of those poems, being a poet himself as well as legislator.*

75, l. 14, for *two first*, r. *other.*

77, l. 17, for *of it*, r. *of Troy.*

82, l. 25, after *agrees to*, add, *the outermost mouth of.*

82, l. penult. after *Dunbarton* add, *in the Clyde.*

83, l. 1, for *the Clyde*, r. *Rosshire, that is according to Ptolomey's direction of the coast, not so far east in point of longitude; for as Itys Fl. has 27° longitude, Loch long in Rosshire must have had more and not less.*

84, l. 5, for *Latin* r. *antient.*

87, l. 24, place *also* before (*8th*) in the foregoing line.

88, l. 26, after *Cullin*, add, *and that the Dovern has changed its course near its mouth, having formerly run nearer to Cullin.*

90, l. 5, for *Latin*, r. *antient.*

do. l. 9. before *the tenth* prefix *for.*

do. lin. pen. for *town*, r. *station.*

91, l. 18, after *Forth*, add, *as well as the river Allan.*

92, l. 17, after *near it*, add, if *Dumb-lain* be a compound word, there seems some remains of *Lindum* in the last syllable *lain*; and possibly by transposition Lin-dum might become Dum-lain.

94 l. 23, for *viz. to the mouth of the Tay*, r. *viz. near the mouth of the Ern.*

96, l. 11, after *Ven*, add, which is perhaps the original in the first syllable of Ptolomey's *Ven-icones* above; for a part of the Grampian mountains, where they approach the east coast above Stone-haven, is at this day called the *Benichin* hills; the country to the southward of them is all low lands, and is the very same spot on which Ptolomey has placed the *Ven-icones*; which name has great resemblance to *Ben-ichin.*

In

ERRATA, &c.

In page 118, l. 24, after *Exænetus*, add, *or Evenetus.*
122, l. 7, for *preceding year*, r. preceding *Olympic year.*
124, l. 15, for 21*ſt*, r. 22*d.*
130, l. 1, after *hic annus*, add, and alſo expreſsly ſays, " that this Roman year was numbered as being the 1014th Olympic year." But he does not ſay the like of the Chaldæan year 986; viz. " that this ſame Roman year 991 was numbered as being the 986th Chaldæan year:" neither could he have ſaid this with truth; for it was but the 985th; and he only obſerves, " that the Chaldæan year, in which he wrote, was numbered as being the 986th. Quorum [ſc. annorum Chaldaicorum] hic annus [Chaldaicus] 986tus.
131, l. 9. for 21*ſt*, r. 22*d.*
148, l. 1, for *not the*, r. *not only the.*
149, l. 7, for *Petavius*, r. *Scaliger and Petavius.*
150, l. penult. for *Niricolaſſarus*, r. *Niricaſſolaſſarus.*
151, l. 16, for *Aridæi*, r. *Aridæus.*
155, l. 20, after *more*, add, *corrupted.*
do. l. 22, for 1613, *r.* 1620.
164, l. 8, after ἡμων, add, χρονος.
183, l. 2. for *all*, r. *ſuch.*

A farther confirmation of the antiquity and originality of the Chaldæan æra, deduced from a proof, that the Chaldæan, Perſian, and Egyptian years, were of the very ſame nature in every reſpect, and had all commenced in a retrograde courſe, upon the ſame Julian day, from the higheſt antiquity; as may be collected from the day on which the Perſian æra of Iſdegird commenced, in the 632d year of Chriſt, united with other circumſtances.

IN the foregoing Number I had to accuſe the authors of our beſt ſyſtems of chronology, antient and modern, with having ſtudiouſly as well as inadvertently adopted ſome

☞ *Addition to the laſt Note in the foregoing Number.*

Err. for εφανησαν r. εκφανισεν. But on conſidering this paſſage again, I doubt whether the critics, who embrace either the common tranſlation, or the emendation before mentioned, are not both equally miſtaken, for it ſeems capable of a third ſenſe better than either: this ariſes from a different conſtruction of ηφανισεν ὁπως. Ηφανισεν is often uſed to mean *obſcured by ſurpaſſing*, and ὁπως ſometimes means *ſo as that*; thus the ſenſe would be, "Nabonaſſar, collecting together accounts of the actions of his predeceſſors, *ſo* obſcured them by his own, *as that* the computation of reigns at Babylon begins from him." In the common tranſlation ὁπως means, like ἱνα, *to the end that*; in the former emendation it ſignifies ὁτι *that (quod)*; but in the ſenſe now propoſed, it means *quomodo* (i. e. *ut*) in oppoſition to ὡλως *iſto modo* (i. e. *ita*) but when ὡλως is omitted by an ellipſis, then ὁπως retains the force of both united, i. e.

ſome errors in the fundamental principles of their ſcience, the effect of which is to run up the whole ſuperior liſt of Jewiſh kings ſeveral years too high; and afterwards I ſhall have

of *ita ut*, *ſo as that*. Vigerus gives the following example φημι δειν ὑμας τοις Ολυνθιοις βοηθειν, και ὁπως τις λεγει καλλισ'α και ταχισ'α, ὁτως αρεσκει μοι. *Demoſth. Ol.* 2. "Dico oportere Olynthiis opem ferre; atque *ut* quis hoc accuratiſſime et diligentiſſime faciendum eſſe dixerit, *ita* mihi placuerit maxime;" or, by tranſpoſition, ὁ̃λως ἀρεσκει μοι, ὁπως τις λεγει, &c; *Ita* mihi placuerit *ut* quis dixerit, &c. But ſometimes ὁτως is omitted, and then ὁπως retains the force of both; as Scapula juſtly obſerves, "ὁπως interdum extra interrogat: ponitur pro ουτω ὡς, ut Iliad 4. ερξον ὁπως εθελεις, fac *quomodo* vis, i. e. fac *ita ut* vis"; ὁ̃τω ερξον, οπως εθελεις; and whatever phraſe is found in poetry, may be ſometimes alſo found in proſe, eſpecially in the leſs claſſical age of Syncellus.

Βηρωσος, ανηρ Χαλδαιος μεν το γενος, γρωριμος δε τοις περι παιδειαν ανασ'ρεφομενοις, επειδη περι τε Αστρονομιας, και περι των Χαλδαιοις φιλοσοφουμενων, αυτος εις τους Ελληνας εξηνεγκε τας συγγραφας. *Joſeph. ad App. lib.* 1.

Βηρωσσος—Ανtιοχῳ τῳ μετα Σελευκον τριτῳ την των Χαλδαιων ισ'ορiαν κατ'αταξας.

Tatian adv. Græcos, & Euſeb. lib. 10.

Altho' critics differ as to which Antiochus King of Syria is here meant, yet they all agree, that it was one of the Kings of Syria (about the time of Ptolomey Philadelphus King of Egypt) to whom Beroſus thus addreſſed his Hiſtory of Babylon; which renders it ſtill more improbable, that he ſhould have introduced into his hiſtory, or into the Chaldæan æra, Egyptian years, when he addreſſed his work to a king, who uſed only Macedonian years and months, unleſs the vulgar

have occaſion to point out ſome other errors equally univerſal, which have contributed to augment this effect; whereby a diſagreement has been produced in ſeveral particulars between Jewiſh and prophane dates, and many ill-founded ſuppoſitions invented by commentators in order to reconcile theſe ſeeming diſagreements: I had to accuſe chronologers likewiſe with having not only neglected and miſunderſtood, but often corrupted alſo the moſt valuable and original record of Aſiatic Chronology, which the ravages of illiterate times had ſpared, and which had alſo happily been tranſmitted to modern ages in an uncorrupt ſtate by the Greek aſtronomers in Egypt; moſt of which errors have been deſignedly embraced, either as being relics of more antient and greater

vulgar year employed in Chaldæa had been the ſame as that in Egypt: we learn alſo from Joſephus above, that Beroſus wrote for the uſe of *The Greeks* in general. Athenæus likewiſe ſays, "That as Beroſus related in his Babylonian antiquities, the Chaldæans celebrated a feſtival called Sacea, on the 16th of the month Lous"; *Deipnos. lib.* 14. It is hence evident, that Beroſus himſelf, in his hiſtory, had explained Chaldæan dates, by Macedonian months, not by Egyptian ones: Macedonian months had been eſtabliſhed at Babylon, before the time of Beroſus 60 years after the death of Alexander, as appears from eclipſes dated by them, and obſerved at Babylon, as recorded in Ptolomey. *Lib.* 9. *c.* 7.

Jewiſh and Chriſtian miſtakes, from which the moderns would not venture to depart, or introduced in order to ſupport ſome preconceived ſuppoſitions of the moderns themſelves in their own interpretations of Jewiſh prophecies, inſtead of trying and aſcertaining the veracity of thoſe prophecies by this indubitable Aſiatic record of time and truth. Under theſe circumſtances it ſeemed requiſite both out of reſpect to the authority of others, and in juſtification of myſelf, that ſome ſpecimen of ſuch errors ſhould be exhibited in a minute and explicit manner: But as the exhibition of other mens errors intermixed with reſearches after truth is ſubject to many diſadvantages in point both of prolixity and abſtruſeneſs; if I ſhall hereafter pay leſs attention to the miſtakes of others, and confine myſelf more to the mere inveſtigation of truth, it is hoped, readers will not conclude, that I am not ſenſible of objections having been made to my proofs, but that I am ſenſible alſo of their having no good foundation, and that the refutation of them would delay us too long in our purſuits.

The *Antiquity* and *Originality* of this Chaldæan æra in its preſent form might be ſtill farther confirmed by another weighty proof, if it did not lead us too far from our propoſed ſubject; for which purpoſe, it may be ſufficient

cient for us to have eſtabliſhed its *accuracy* by other means: by this proof it would appear, that there could have been no ſuch transformation of it into an Egyptian form, as Petavius, Dodwell and Jackſon, have ſuppoſed;* becauſe in reality the Chaldæan, Perſian, and Egyptian years, if not the Armenian alſo, were antiently all of the very ſame nature, and the new year's day of each was not only retrograde alike from the ſame cauſe, the want of an intercalation of the overplus quarter of a day, but had alſo actually commenced in each nation on the very ſame Julian day from the higheſt antiquity; juſt as the Julian year had antiently prevailed in many parts of Aſia

* Titulus ſolus Chaldaicus eſt, *anni deſcriptio Ægyptiorum propria, non Chaldæorum*-cum enim Ægyptii mathematicas omnes obſervationes ex Chaldæorum commentariis didiciſſent, ubi illæ Nabonaſſari æra conſignatæ legebantur, eaſdem cum Epocha Nabonaſſari ad annum ſuum applicarunt; ſimiliter ac Chronologi hodie anni Juliani formam ad Græcorum & aliorum tempus accommodant. *Petav. Doctr. temp. lib.* 3. *c.* 6.

In canone aſtronomico, et in *ea etiam ejuſdem verſione*, quam Græcorum Aſtronomorum uſibus accommodavit Hipparchus, &c. *Dodw. App. Cypr. Diſſ. ſect.* 37.

It does not appear that the Babylonians ever uſed the Egyptian year, which moved backward one day in 4 years, but they probably added a ſixth intercalary day, every fourth year. Hence it is plain that in the canon, Egyptian years were applied to it by Ptolomey after the manner of Egyptian Aſtronomers, by a retrogradation of the new year's day. *Jackſ. v.* 1. 439.

as well as ſtill in Europe; whereby diſtant, and apparently unconnected nations had began their new year at the very ſame time. Scaliger had long ago, and was (I believe) the firſt, who ſtarted this opinion,* the force of which, however, he diminiſhed himſelf by annexing to it many fanciful ſuppoſitions, no way founded in truth. Petavius refuted theſe ſuppoſitions, yet at the ſame time acknowledged, that the original opinion itſelf, on which Scaliger ſet out, was in all probability true†. Now Scaliger's opinion, we ſee, went ſo far as to affirm, "that in all theſe nations their new year had ever commenced on the ſame day": for although he allowed, that each nation might not always ſubjoin the 5 Epagomenæ to the end of their year, but

* Omnibus nationibus quæ anno æquabili uſæ ſunt, ab initio *idem caput* anni fuit: ita eadem initia menſium habebant, hoc uno excepto, ſi quid mutatione Epagomenarum variabat; nam illæ quinque appendices dies aliis aliam ſedem habebant: Chaldæi, Perſæ, Armenii, Ægyptii unum eundemque annum norant; ſed collocatio quinque extremarum dierum nonnihil ſtatum illorum anni inter ſe diſſimilem faciebat. *De Emend. temp. lib.* 3. *caput de neuruz veterum Perſarum.*

† Quo genere anni uſi ſunt Egyptii, de Perſis idem docet Alfraganus & alii, nimirum vagum annum: de Chaldæis veteribus aliis que populis id ipſum non ſine probabilitate defenditur; ſed ad communem hanc ce veriſimilemque doctrinam addit quam plurima Scaliger nulla auctoritate. *Petav. Præf. ad lib.* 3.

ſome

ſome to the end of one month, and ſome to the end of another, whereby the commencement of ſome of their months would differ 5 days; yet as they would all inſert theſe 5 days ſomewhere in every year, the new year's day of each would nevertheleſs commence on the ſame Julian day. But Petavius, as one ſhould think from the firſt of the above two extracts, muſt have conceived, that there was ſtill ſome greater difference between Chaldæan and Egyptian years, than what would be cauſed by the different place of theſe 5 days (and in fact it was not ſuppoſed even by Scaliger, that they had any different place in the Chaldæan and Egyptian years, but only in the Perſian and Armenian) otherwiſe why ſhould Petavius there call the year employed in the æra of Nabonaſſar, *Ægyptiorum propria non Chaldæorum*, if their years were really both alike? That firſt paſſage then ſeems to ſtand in contradiction to this ſecond one, in his preface to the ſame book; at leaſt it leaves us in doubt how far he conceived the two years to agree, and in what they differed; and poſſibly he himſelf had formed no ſteady opinion about it. Dodwell alſo ſeems to have fallen into a ſimilar contradiction, or to have been equally wavering concerning the very ſame article: for altho' he had affirmed in his *Cyprian Diſſertations*

tations (1684) as quoted above, that Hipparchus had made a transformation (*verſio*) of the Chaldæan æra for the uſe of Greek Aſtronomers; yet in his tract *De Cyclis veterum*, (1701) he aſſerts, "that when Egypt was ſubjected to the Perſians, not only the æra of Nabonaſſar, but alſo the Babylonian form of year was introduced into Egypt", and that he meant, introduced into vulgar civil uſe, not merely among the aſtronomers, ſeems evident from the ſubjoined quotation.* This paſſage can be no way reconciled to that quoted from his *Cypr. Diſſ.* unleſs the word *verſio* be ſuppoſed to mean only a transformation from Egyptian to Grecian years and months, which ſenſe the context does no way ſeem to countenance. It is a defect then in Petavius, as well as in Dodwell's tract, that they have not delivered explicitly at leaſt, nor yet juſtly, their own ſentiments concerning the nature of the Chaldæan and Perſian years; which ſubject ſince

* Numerantur anni *Ægyptii* ab Epocha Nabonaſſari, quod ſcilicet à Babyloniis, cum in regum Perſarum poteſtatem redigeretur Ægyptus, *cum anni forma* etiam Epocha a Nabonaſſaro ducta ad Ægyptios emanavit—Ut a Babyloniis Epocham ipſam Nabon. & anni formam acceperunt Ægyptii; ſic etiam *dierum civilium initia* ab iiſdem ſimiliter accepiſſe. *Dodw. de Cyclis Diſſ.* 2. *ſect.* 5.

the

the altercations of Scaliger and Petavius has lain in this confuſed and contradictory ſtate. Neither have Chriſtmannus and Golius, in their notes on Alfraganus, or Dr. Hyde, in his *Relig. Perſar.* by any means removed this confuſion. Vignoles has advanced one ſtep towards it, by having concluded, as a thing probable, from the form of expreſſion employed by Ptolomey, that the Chaldæan months ſeem to have coincided altogether with the Egyptian months*: yet ſtill it will not follow hence, that the firſt Chaldæan month coincided with the firſt Egyptian month, and that the two years began on the

* His proof is founded on this remark, that Ptolomey often gives us Greek obſervations, dated by Greek years, months and days (of which ſee an inſtance above, at p. 172) and then he reduces theſe to their correſpondent Egyptian years, months and days; but he never once gives us any Chaldæan obſervation by the original date of Chaldæan years, months and days. Hence Vignoles concludes, that the reaſon of this different conduct of Ptolomey, in not alſo reducing Chaldæan dates to Egyptian dates, was, becauſe there was in reality no difference between them, except in the names of the months, conſequently no occaſion for any ſuch reduction: and he ſtrengthens this concluſion by ſhewing, that wherever there was any difference, as in their meridians, then Ptolomey gives us the obſervation by the Chaldæan meridian, and reduces it to the Egyptian meridian. *Chron. ſar. Lib.* 5. *c.* 1. 6.

ſame Julian day. This then is a point which has never, ſince it was ſtarted by Scaliger, been either proved or diſproved, or even taken into proper conſideration by any writer; but which, however, as I think, I ſhall be able to prove with reſpect to the Egyptian and Perſian years; and as theſe were in *every other* reſpect ſimilar to the more antient Chaldæan year, and probably borrowed thence, either by Cyrus at his conqueſt of Babylon, or before, this will bring the concluſion very ſtrongly in favour of the ſame fact being true with reſpect to the Chaldæan year alſo: but as the proof of this will however require many inveſtigations, and would lead us too far from our propoſed ſubject, it muſt therefore be poſtponed. Yet it may not be amiſs juſt to hint, at preſent, whence the proofs of this point will be deduced, namely, from a fact allowed by all chronologers, and certainly true, that in the 1ſt year of the Perſian æra of Iſdegird, commencing on the 16th of June, in the 632d year of Chriſt, and reckoned by retrograde years of the ſame nature as the Egyptian, the 1ſt Perſian month *Pharvardin* altogether coincided with the 4th Egyptian month *Choiac*; therefore it began only 3 months later than the Thoth, or new year's day of the Egyptian year. But before

fore this æra a fixed year had been introduced into Perſia, as all writers agree; yet when it had commenced no author has attempted to determine: now if it had ſubſiſted there no more than 360 years, that is, from the 272d year of Chriſt, then this difference of 3 Perſian months, of 30 days each, and 90 in all, will be exactly the number of days which would be intercalated during theſe 360 years; conſequently in that year (the 272d) the Perſian and Egyptian years both commenced on the ſame Julian day, the 16th of June; and if the Perſian was not (as I can prove) intercalated before that year, the two years muſt, therefore, have ever before commenced on the ſame Julian day from all antiquity.

But whether I may ever have either leiſure or ability to ſet this additional proof in a clear light, or whether what I have urged in the foregoing number in favour of the *antiquity* and *originality* of the æra of Nabonaſſar, in its preſent form, both from the apparent relics of it in Beroſus, and the inutility of ſuch a transformation to any hiſtoric or aſtronomic purpoſe, may have ſufficient weight or not; yet the following truth, at leaſt, muſt appear clear and decided, that any ſuch pretended transformation muſt have been made by able hands, in an early age,

ſoon after the end of the æra; ſo that with reſpect to its *accuracy* we have good reaſon, nevertheleſs, to conclude with Dodwell, "that the dates preſerved in it are of the moſt certain kind.*" Conſequently this native Aſiatic æra muſt be a ſurer guide to Aſiatic events, before the time of Xerxes, than the hearſay evidence of the beſt Greek hiſtorians, or the conjectures of modern critics; nay it will be often found able to ſupply omiſſions in what antient hiſtorians have imperfectly related, and to recover to us many articles of loſt hiſtoric intelligence, which they have not related at all: it is wonderful then that ſo little attention has been given hitherto, either to aſcertain the real method of reckoning employed in this æra, or to vindicate its accuracy againſt the wanton corruptions of ſome chronologers, and its originality againſt the ill-founded conjectures of others; notwithſtanding that hereby the veracity of various hiſtoric dates in the Old Teſtament will, at the ſame time, be more ſecurely proved.

* Hac ipſa phænomenorum hiſtoria niti conſtat Hypotheſes Hipparchi & Ptolomæi, ut plane non ſit, quod dubitemus canones hoſce fuiſſe omnium certiſſimos. *Cypr. Diſſ. ſ.* 22.

The right method of reckoning in the Chaldæan æra is proved to be, that each King's reign begins at the new year's day before his acceſſion, therefore that each King entered into 1 *year of reign more than is marked in the table, and that all the odd months of his laſt year are included in the firſt year of his ſucceſſor.*

IT remains then, that we enquire into the real method of reckoning employed in this Chaldæan æra. Now this is a queſtion which the old chronologers, Scaliger, Calviſius, Petavius, Helvicus and Uſher, ſeem never to have taken into conſideration any where throughout their works; nor yet to have followed uniformly any one particular method whatever; for they ſometimes make the laſt year of each reign end *before* each King's death, and ſometimes *after* it, juſt as it happens beſt to ſuit with the dates of other authors; which makes often a difference of a whole year. Dodwell was the firſt (as far as I have obſerved) who has entered into the merits of this queſtion, namely, in the Appendix to his Cyprian Diſſertations; wherein he proves, from the dates of the æra of Philip, compared with the dates of the death of ſeveral Roman Emperors, as given by antient hiſtorians, that the firſt and

every

every following year attributed to every Emperor in that æra is not reckoned, as in modern times throughout Europe, from the day of his acceſſion to the anniverſary of that acceſſion in the following year; but "from the Egyptian new year's day next *before* his acceſſion, to that *after* it." From what was thus practiſed in the table during the æra of Philip, he forms a juſt concluſion, that the ſame method obtained alſo in the preceding Chaldæan æra; although from the hiſtory of thoſe times being in great meaſure loſt, we are not here able to prove the ſame rule to hold good ſo completely as during the æra of Philip; wherein hiſtory has preſerved to us an account of the time of year at which each Roman Emperor died. Hence it follows, that every year marked in the table is a complete Chaldæan (or Egyptian) year, beginning and ending at the new year's day of that year; and the laſt year marked there always ends at the new year's day next *before* each King's death; ſo that all the odd months of a predeceſſor above a complete year, are always included in the firſt year of the ſucceſſor; and thus his reign in the table may often commence almoſt a whole year *before* his real acceſſion; for if he acceded more than a ſingle day before a new year, he would reckon at that following new year

year a ſecond year of reign to commence. This advantage, however, follows from this method, namely, that all errors of odd months are avoided, and there cannot poſſibly be any omiſſions of them, without an omiſſion of a whole year; but by this method it can never be known how much of the *firſt* year of any reign belongs to the predeceſſor, and how much to the ſucceſſor; yet this, at leaſt, we are certain of, that the *laſt* year of each belongs *entirely* to the predeceſſor, and that each King in the table entered into 1 year of reign more, than that which is marked as being his laſt nominal year. This then was the manifeſt cauſe of Petavius's complaint, "that Ptolomey often makes the Roman Emperors, after Caligula, begin their reign 1 year too ſoon*;" the fact is true, yet in reality the error was only in himſelf, by his not having obſerved, that it is the uniform rule and method in the table, *for each reign to commence at the new year's day before any King's actual acceſſion.* In the caſe, however, of Adrian, there was alſo another reaſon, namely, becauſe his reign,

* Ptolomæus in omnibus Lunæ obſervationibus, quas Adriani annis aſſignat, uno anno ejus *anticipavit* imperium. *Petav. Ration. Temp. Pars.* 2. *lib.* 4. *c.* 6.
In annis Imperatorum *unius anni errore* lapſus eſt. *Ibid.*

and

and that of all other Roman Emperors, commence in the table from the year of their adoption into partnerſhip in the Empire, not from the death of their colleague; as Dodwell has alſo ſhewn (Ibid. ſect. 48.) But Petavius was not the only author who has fallen into this error, of miſtaking the method of reckoning employed throughout the table: for Whiſton and Prideaux have fallen into the ſame, notwithſtanding that Dodwell had ſhewn the right method of reckoning before their time; and theſe authors have miſled other chronologers ſince. This error of the moderns might poſſibly ariſe from their miſtaking the meaning of Dodwell's words; who although he has very clearly and repeatedly proved, in every one of the *particular* examples examined by him under the Roman Emperors, that the method above mentioned is the real method of reckoning in the æra of Philip;* yet, unfortunately, in the words of his *general* rule, he has expreſſed himſelf with ſo much ambiguity, that no one can with certainty

* Except in the example of the firſt year of the Auguſtan æra (ſect. 35.) where he has erroneouſly placed the capture of Alexandria a year too ſoon, as Vignoles has juſtly obſerved; (lib. 5. c. 2. ſect. 4. p. 5.) which error being rectified, this example will agree with the reſt.

com-

comprehend his meaning, until one examines ſome of thoſe *particular* examples. His *general* rule is "Quot interceſſiſſent novi Thoth (i. e. initia novi anni Egyptiaci) tot numerentur ab exordio non anni modo Nabonaſſari, ſed & regum etiam ſingulorum." (ſect. 36.) Now theſe words do not determine clearly, whether the year which *preceeds* the 1ſt new year's day after acceſſion, is to be reckoned as the 1ſt year of reign, or whether that year which *follows* the 1ſt new year's day aforementioned; for, in either caſe, the number of Thoths are the ſame: but it is impoſſible to look into any one of his *particular* examples without being immediately convinced, that Dodwell both meant the former of theſe two, and determined rightly.*

But Mr. Allin, whom Mr. Whiſton truſted to examine this queſtion, miſtook, as if Dodwell had meant, that in caſe a King outlived any new year's day, he num-

* It may be proper for me to ſubjoin one particular example in juſtification of my conſtruction of Dodwell's general rule, "Tiberio tribuit canon annos 22; deſinent Anno Domini 36: Mortuus eſt Tiberius Ann. Dom. 37, Mart, 16 *ante* Thoth Auguſti 14, qui proinde Caio imputandus eſt. Caius imperavit annos 4: numerentur, pro Canonis rationibus, ab Anno Dom. 36. *ſect.* 38.

bered all the remainder of that Egyptian year among the years of his own reign;* whereas Dodwell plainly meant the directly contrary: and he determines the ſame concerning thoſe examples which he was able to examine in the Chaldæan æra before the æra of Philip; but it is only in a very few caſes, that hiſtory has tranſmitted any particulars during the Chaldæan æra, whereby we are able to form any certain concluſion; our rule concerning this muſt therefore be formed from what obtained under the æra of Philip, which was, indeed, only a continuation of the former æra under the ſame circumſtances, therefore, probably, ſubject to the ſame method of reckoning. However, at leaſt, the ſame fact may be certainly proved in *one inſtance*, namely in the laſt reign of the Chaldæan æra; for the æra of Philip begins above half a year before Alexander's death, who died in the ſummer; whereas the 1ſt year of Philip, his ſucceſſor, commences (as all Chronologers agree in with Dodwell)

* "Though any King ſhould die immediately *after* the firſt of Thoth, yet all the reſt of that year, till the next firſt of Thoth, is attributed to his reign in the Canon." *Whiſton's Short View of Chronol. p.* 14. 1702. For proof of the above we are there referred to Dodwell's Diſſert, in prim. vol. Geog. Græc. Minor. p. 81,

on

on the 12th of November before the death of Alexander: If then the like rule obtained in this *one*, though the laſt example during the Chaldæan æra, it muſt be reaſonably ſuppoſed to obſerve the ſame rule uniformly in all preceding examples throughout.* Nevertheleſs, Prideaux, in his Connexion of ſacred and prophane Hiſtory (Anno 1715) has fallen into the very ſame miſtake as Whiſton's friend, and probably copied it thence†; for I know of no Chronologer, at leaſt among ourſelves, who had before his time agitated this queſtion, except Dodwell; who, as I have ſhewn, had determined in direct contradiction to Prideaux's method.

* Accordingly, ſince Dodwell, Vignoles has proved the ſame rule to hold in ſeveral examples of Perſian Kings, inſerted in the Chaldean æra; but they are too full of intricacy to be produced here, vid. his *Chronol. ſacrèe, Berlin* 1738. *lib.* 5. *ch.* 2. *ſect.* 4. *paragr.* 2. "In this Canon (ſays he) the firſt year of each King commences with the year, which is *current* at his acceſſion, although a conſiderable part of it ſhould have been already paſt; one has juſt as many proofs of it as there are Kings, with the time of whoſe death we have been made acquainted."

† "In the Canon of Ptolomey it is the method to aſcribe all the year to him, who was King in the beginning of it, how ſoon ſoever he died after, and not to reckon the reign of the ſucceſſor, but from the firſt day of the year enſuing." *At year before Chriſt* 556.

Here then is *a ſecond* falſe principle of Chronologers pointed out relative to this ſubject; and although the above rule for the right method of reckoning is an univerſal one, obſerved invariably throughout the æra, yet there will be ſtill found *two caſes*, in which this ſingle rule is not ſufficient to guide us, without the aſſiſtance of two other rules, both of which have been in like manner miſtaken.

The effects of the two foregoing falſe principles counteract each other, in fixing the end of the Jewiſh captivity; which, by the Chaldæan æra, is ſhewn to have laſted, at leaſt, 69 years, after the firſt capture of Jeruſalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

THE firſt falſe principle was adopted, in order by the interpolation of two or three years, either at the beginning, or the middle, or the end of the captivity, to lengthen out its duration to 70 years; but the ſecond error, by placing the end of the Babylonian kingdom with the victory of Cyrus over Nabonadius too early, has placed the end of the captivity too early alſo, and thus has abridged the duration of it again; which ſhews that there would have been little occaſion for the firſt erroneous corruption of the æra, adopted againſt all reaſon, if the ſecond error had been corrected, for which correction there is very good reaſon; whereas Chronologers, by thus undoing in part what they had done before, have forced themſelves into a *third* error, and contrivance to lengthen out the captivity, by introducing a ſuppoſititious King Cyaxares 2d between Nabonadius and Cyrus, to whom they aſſign

2 years

2 years of reign before the captivity ends; but of this more hereafter. Petavius is the only old author who has not adopted the ſecond falſe principle as well as the firſt; yet, though he was right in this, he drew no advantage from it; but the more modern ones, Uſher, Marſhall's Tables, Prideaux, Whiſton, and the Univerſal Hiſtory*, all agree in placing the victory of Cyrus over Nabonadius too high, that is, in his 17th year (Anno 539 Ant. Chriſt) or ſooner; whereas from the foregoing right method of reckoning, it is evident, that Nabonadius muſt have fully completed his 17th year, and could not have loſt his throne by the victory of Cyrus, until ſometime in his 18th year, which was the 210th Chaldæan year, therefore not until the year before

* The author of the laſt rightly obſerves, indeed, (B. 1. c. 9. ſ. 3.) "That the fall of the Babylonian empire was in the 18th of Nabonadius, though, according to the canon, he reigned but 17 years;" nevertheleſs he has placed the 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar in the 605th year before Chriſt, which is 1 year too early; therefore, neither has he derived any advantage from his remark, ſince he has made the 18th year end where the 17th ought to have ended; and, in conſequence, he has placed the capture of Babylon 1 year too high alſo, viz. in the 538th year before Chriſt, inſtead of the 537th.

Chriſt

Chriſt 538.* Vignoles is the only one, ſince Petavius, who in conſequence of his having obſerved what was the real method of the æra, has rightly placed this victory ſo low as 538†, the 210th year; from which, deducting 143, there remain 67 years of captivity, including both the extreme years, and not 66 only, as according to other authors. But the capture of Babylon itſelf could not have been effected until a year ſtill later than the above victory; and the delivery of the Jews could not have been until after the capture of Babylon, therefore there will be ſtill 2 years more down to the end of the *firſt year* of Cyrus *after the capture of Babylon*; conſequently 69 in all; and this is what the Jews meant by *his firſt year:* now if I ſhew, moreover, that the captivity began 1 year before the acceſſion of Nebuchadnezzar, viz. in the 143d year, there will thus be found full 70 years for its duration, without any corruption whatever of the Chaldæan æra, and merely by attending to the right

* The year of our foundation date 268, being conumerary with the year before Chriſt 480, from 267 deduct 209 (the 17th of Nabonadius) there remain 58, which added to 480, amount to 538 only.

† Chron. ſacr. lib. 5. c. 14. ſect. 7. num. 3.

method

method of reckoning by it; whereby a foundation will be laid for a better agreement between Jewiſh and prophane dates in a variety of other caſes. The whole may appear more clearly, perhaps, by the following ſketch of the variations of Chronologers in the dates of theſe events.

HIS-

Years after Capt. Jeruſ.	Years before Chriſt	Years of Chal. Æra.	Dates of Reigns	HISTORIC EVENTS, *And erroneous Dates of them.*
	625	123	1	Of Nabopollaſar, father of Nebuchadnezzar.
	610			*The 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar and 3d of Jehoiakim, and firſt capture of Jeruſalem, according to Euſebius.*
	608	140		*The 4th of Jehoiakim, and firſt capture of Jeruſalem according to Scaliger, Calviſius and Helvicus.*
	607	141	19	*The 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar and 4th of Jehoiakim, and firſt capture of Jeruſalem according to Petavius and Uſher.*
	606	142	20	*The 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar and 4th of Jehoiakim, and firſt capture of Jeruſalem according to Prideaux.—The 4th of Jehoiakim and capture of Jeruſalem according to Univerſal Hiſt.*
	605	143	21	*The 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar according to Univerſal Hiſtory.—The 4th of Jehoiakim according to Vignoles and Blair.*—The firſt capture of Jeruſalem according to Vignoles, and the truth; Nebuchadnezzar being only General of his father's army, who died in the following year.
1	604	144	1	The nominal 1ſt year of Nebuchadnezzar according to the reckoning in the Chaldæan æra, and beginning on the 21ſt of January; but it might be near the end of this year before Nebuchadnezzar really aſcended the throne by his father's death; Vignoles, Jackſon and Blair have rightly fixed this acceſſion, but Jackſon alone has rightly made the 4th of Jehoiakim cotemporary with this year.
	591	157		*The temple burnt in the 11th of Zedekiah according to Euſebius, the 71ſt year before the 2d of Darius the Firſt.*
	588	160		*The temple burnt according to Univerſal Hiſtory, and Prideaux.*
	587	161		*The temple burnt according to Blair.*
	586	162	19	The true date of the burning of the temple according to the Chaldæan æra and ſcripture in the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar.
		193	1	Of Nabonadius the laſt King of Babylon.
	541			*Firſt year of Cyrus over Babylon, according to Euſebius.*
	540	208	16	*Cyrus obtained his victory over Nabonadius according to Univerſal Hiſtory.*
66	539	209	17	Cyrus only now really marched from Perſia to the river Gyndes, where he wintered according to Herod: and Vignoles: and entered Babylonia in the following ſpring. *But according to Uſher, Cyrus now obtained his great victory, and according to Prideaux, took Babylon alſo in this year.*
67	538	210	1	The firſt nominal year of Cyrus over Babylonia by Chaldæan æra; therefore he did not obtain his victory over Nabonadius until the Midſummer of this year, according to Vignoles and the truth. *But according to Uſher, Blair and Univerſal Hiſtory, the city of Babylon was taken in this year.*
68	537	211	2	The true date of the capture of Babylon at earlieſt, and in Auguſt, 1 year after the victory; therefore the edict for the delivery of the Jews could not be publiſhed before the end of this year or beginning of the next.
69	536	212	3	The real *firſt* year of Cyrus after the capture of Babylon, and the 70th after the firſt capture of Jeruſalem incluſively. *According to Jackſon Babylon was not taken until this year, but he has brought it down ſo low only by interpolating 2 years into the Chaldæan æra.*
		228	2	Year of Darius according to the Chaldæan æra, Euſebius, Blair and the truth.
	480	268	6	Year of Xerxes according to the Chaldæan æra, and all the above authors.

By the above ſketch it appears, that Chronologers have been continually bringing down the commencement and end of the captivity lower and lower; that Jackſon however is the only one, who places the 4th of Jehoiakim, and Vignoles the only one who places the end of the captivity ſo low as they ought; that the moſt common chronology in England, by Prideaux, the Univerſal Hiſtory, and Blair is more erroneous than by the former two; and Petavius and Uſher ſtill more miſtaken than the latter authors, yet leſs than their predeceſſors. As to the firſt queſtion, the juſtification of Jackſon in fixing the 4th of Jehoiakim ſo low as the year 604, this will come under a more minute conſideration afterwards; at preſent it is ſufficient to obſerve, that we have found with certainty this to be the Julian year, on which the 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar falls, according to the Chaldæan æra, and moſt others agree in the ſame; now the ſcripture expreſſly and repeatedly mentions the 4th of Jehoiakim as having been cotemporary with the 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar.* But our buſineſs at preſent is ra-

* "The word that came unto Jeremiah in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, that the 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon." *Jerem.* c. xxv. 1.

ther

ther with the end of the captivity, than with the commencement; and it appears that Vignoles is the only author who has adhered faithfully to the right method of reckoning by the Chaldæan æra, toward fixing the capture of Babylon ſo low as it ought to fall; in conſequence of which he has ſhewn, that the *firſt year* of Cyrus *after the capture of Babylon*, neceſſarily falls as low as the Julian year 536 before Chriſt; which is the very year to which all other Chronologers alſo have brought down the delivery of Jews from captivity, although by very different means from Vignoles. For all others have contrived to bring this event ſo low by interpolating the Chaldæan æra, or elſe by corrupting the truth of hiſtory with a ſuppoſititious Cyaxares the 2d. taken from Joſephus and Xenophon, to whom they allot 2 years of reign after the end of Nabonadius and before the acceſſion of Cyrus: whereas by adhering ſtrictly to the method of the Chaldæan æra and the relations of Beroſus and Herodotus, it appears, that the dates in ſcripture agree ſo harmoniouſly of themſelves with theſe prophane authors, that there is no occaſion for any chimerical ſuppoſitions, nor yet even any room for this pretended Cyaxares; ſince Nabonadius was ſtill on the throne during

the firſt year attributed to this pretended King, and Babylon was not taken by Cyrus until near the end of the ſecond year attributed to him. As to the Darius Mede mentioned in Daniel, and by many ſuppoſed to be the ſame as this Cyaxares, we ſhall find reaſon to conclude, that he was no other than Cyrus himſelf. But in order to verify theſe particulars more certainly, it is neceſſary that we enter into conſideration of another rule to guide us in the right method of reckoning by the Chaldæan æra.

That in the Chaldæan æra, when the acceſſion of a King happens by conqueſt, his acceſſion is dated from the year of his moſt deciſive victory, not from the capture of the metropolis, or of the laſt city which held out againſt him.

I Obſerved above (p. 220) that there were *two caſes*, in which the general rule there pointed out for right reckoning by the Chaldæan æra, was not ſufficient to guide us without danger of error; the contents of this ſection will explain the nature of *one* of thoſe two caſes, the *other* will be conſidered afterwards, when our enquiries are affected by it. Now all Chronologers, except Vignoles, have fixed their date of the *capture of Babylon* on a ſuppoſition, that it muſt have preceded, or at leaſt could not have been later than the 1ſt year of Cyrus in the Chaldæan æra: but Vignoles has juſtly ſhewn this to be a miſtake, ariſing from their not having ſufficiently attended to the method of the Chaldæan æra.* When an ordinary ſucceſſion by death happens in that table, then the year in which that death took place determines the ſame to be the firſt year of the ſucceſſor, agreeably to the rule before eſtabliſhed. But ſtill

* Chronologie Sacrée, Lib. 5. c. 14. ſ. 7. n. 3.

we

we are at a loſs to know how we are to determine, when a ſucceſſion does not happen by death, but by a revolution effected by conqueſt: for if this war laſted more years than one, it becomes a doubt in which of theſe years the conqueror's acceſſion ought in reaſon, and does in fact commence in the Chaldæan table; in *this caſe* then there requires ſome farther rule to enable us to fix ſuch events to right dates. Shall we ſay that it is moſt reaſonable for the conqueror to date his acceſſion to the conquered kingdom from the year in which his firſt victory was obtained? Or from the year in which he became maſter of the metropolis? Or from the year of his moſt deciſive victory? Or from the capture of the laſt fortified town, or not until the death of the conquered King, in caſe theſe events happened in different years? If it be not the moſt reaſonable, yet, at leaſt, it muſt be thought a very reaſonable method to date this acceſſion from the year of the moſt *deciſive victory*; ſince in fact it muſt have been this which made him maſter of the kingdom, notwithſtanding that the metropolis and a few other fortified places, might hold out againſt him a year or two longer. But which ever method may be thought the moſt reaſonable, yet it appears, that in fact it was the method

thod obſerved in the Chaldæan table, to date a conqueror's acceſſion from the year of the moſt deciſive victory, although the metropolis was not taken until a following year, and although the conquered King was ſtill alive and at the head of an army. There might have been ſeveral revolutions by conqueſt during this æra, but the hiſtory of thoſe times has for the moſt part periſhed; it is a fortunate circumſtance then that the æra ends with the memorable reign of Alexander; whoſe actions, together with the dates of them, have been preſerved to us by other means, by Greek and Roman authors: and this is the only example throughout the whole æra, wherein we have an opportunity to examine and aſcertain what method was followed in the Chaldæan æra, during preceding ages, in the like caſes of a revolution by conqueſt. Now the Chaldæan æra places the 1ſt year of Alexander over the kingdoms of Perſia and Babylonia, in the year 417; which was conumerary with the 2d year of the 112th Olympiad; and this was the very year in which Alexander obtained his *deciſive victory* at Arbela over Darius, about the beginning of October, therefore not until about 10 months after the commencement of the 417th year, which began then about the middle

middle of November: he got poſſeſſion of Babylon in the ſame Julian year, and poſſibly in the ſame Chaldæan year before November, but at leaſt not long before the end of that year; poſſibly not until the middle of November, becauſe (according to ſome) the fixed Macedonian year, afterwards eſtabliſhed at Babylon, commenced about the middle of a Julian month: however notwithſtanding that this Chaldæan year was ſo nearly expired, yet we ſee that the Chaldæan æra carried back the commencement of Alexander's firſt year as far as to the preceding Chaldæan new year's day in November, above 10 months before his victory, and almoſt a complete year before his poſſeſſion of Babylon. After remaining at Babylon about 30 days, as Diodorus relates, he marched his army towards Perſia, and the two metropolitan cities, Suſa and Perſepolis; of which he did not get poſſeſſion until near the riſing of the *Virgiliæ**, therefore not until near May, from thence he proceeded againſt Darius, who was advancing from Bactriana at the head of an army to give him battle, but juſt before the armies met, Darius was ſlain by the treachery of ſome of his own commanders. Thus it

* Interiorem Perſidis regionem ſub ipſum Virgiliarum Sydus petiit. *Curtius l.* 5.

appears

appears, that in this caſe there was every reaſon to delay the acceſſion of Alexander until the following year 418, if it had not been the method obſerved in the preceding part of the æra, to date ſuch revolutions from the moſt deciſive victory. The only circumſtance in which this caſe differs from that of Cyrus is, that Alexander might poſſibly have got poſſeſſion of Babylon, the capital of Babylonia, before the end of the 417th year, although not of the two capitals of the Perſian empire: but as Babylon was then a defenceleſs town, the walls having been demoliſhed by Darius the 1ſt, and as the whole had been now ſubject to Perſia above 200 years, ſo that the memory of having been a ſeparate kingdom independant of Perſia, muſt have been almoſt obliterated; there ſeems no ſufficient pretence to ſuppoſe, that the Babylonians would have fixed in their æra the acceſſion of Alexander to the empire, by the circumſtance of his being in poſſeſſion of their own declining capital only; while the two real and moſt flouriſhing capitals of that empire, to which they were ſubject, were ſtill in the hands of that King, to whom they had been ſo long in ſubjection: and even if we could ſuppoſe this, yet it is dubious, whether Alexander did enter Babylon before the end of the

417th year; but at moſt, ſince he could not have poſſeſſed himſelf of it above a few days before the end of the 417th year; one ſhould think this ſingle circumſtance, that he entered Babylon before the end of the year could never have been a ſufficient motive for their throwing back his acceſſion to the preceding, rather than to the following year, without their taking into conſideration as a more important motive, the glorious victory which at Arbela had, in truth, decided the fates of the two contending Kings about ſix weeks before. Eſpecially if we conſider moreover, that the Chaldæan æra ſince the conqueſt of Babylon by Cyrus, ſeems to have been the vulgar æra by which the Perſians themſelves had now reckoned during 200 years, as well as the Babylonians †; in which therefore one cannot well ſuppoſe, that the latter would at the conqueſt of Alexander, make any innovation ſeparate from and independently of the Perſians, who, as we have ſeen, could not

† Sir Iſaac Newton was apparently of this opinion, when he ſays, "This year [uſed in the æra of Nabonaſſar] was received by the Perſian empire from the Babylonians." *Chron.* 81. Dodwell muſt have been of the ſame opinion, ſee p. 208 above, at note; and we ſhall afterwards find reaſons in Herodotus to confirm the ſame. It is again corroborated at p. 132 by the date of the 13th of Darius in Thucydides

with

with any propriety place the acceſſion of Alexander before the 418th year, unleſs they reckoned this acceſſion from the year of the deciſive victory at Arbela.

It is unfortunate, that th oughout the æra of Philip there does not occur one example which can aſſiſt to aſcertain this queſtion, and confirm the above example of Alexander: under Auguſtus indeed there was a like revolution at his conqueſt of Egypt; but nothing can be collected from this, becauſe he finiſhed his conqueſt in the ſame year in which he landed his troops and took Alexandria the capital. The following circumſtance, however, may be thought to add ſome degree of confirmation to the caſe of Alexander; namely, that all Roman Emperors in the æra of Philip, are found to have their acceſſion dated as early as poſſible, and ſooner than by other authors; that is, Adrian and others are dated from the year in which they were adopted into partnerſhip in the empire, and not, as commonly, from the death of their colleague who adopted them. The caſe of Auguſtus, nevertheleſs, as well as that of Alexander, both agree in this, that is in affording proofs of a point debated before; for the 1ſt year of both conquerors commenced at the Chaldæan new year's day next *before* their reſpective victo-

ries, not at that *after* them. Upon the whole then, there ſeems good reaſon for us to agree to the ſuggeſtion of Vignoles, that the 1ſt of Cyrus in this æra is dated from the year of his deciſive victory *: but Beroſus has proved, that this victory could not have been obtained before the 17th *real* year of Nabonadius (ſee p. 184) which was the 18th nominal year of the æra; and both Herodotus and Xenophon have informed us, that the capture of Babylon itſelf was not effected until a *long time* after this victory; conſequently all Chronologers, except Vignoles, have been in an error in placing the capture of Babylon as early as the firſt year of Cyrus. It is indeed uncertain what diſtance of time might have intervened between theſe events; ſome authors have ſaid two years, but this is mere conjecture, not ſupported by antient teſtimony: however, from the accounts of Herodotus and Xenophon, we may reaſonably collect, that at leaſt it could not be leſs than one year. For Herodotus informs us, that Cyrus wintered upon the banks of the river Gyndes, and marched toward Babylon in the ſpring†; where the Chaldæan army waited his approach; he could not then obtain his victory long before Midſummer:

* *L.* 5. *c.* 14. *ſ.* 7. num. 3. † Lib. 1.

but

but in June and July the Euphrates overflows its banks, which would have fruſtrated all attempts on the city for ſome time. Herodotus accordingly ſays, that he beſieged it ſo long, "*that he was at loſs what counſel to take*, and that nothing he had attempted had been attended with any advantage to him." Theſe words muſt be thought to imply a longer ſiege than of a few months; he could have no reaſon to be at his wit's end in ſo ſhort time, conſidering the length to which ſieges were generally protracted in thoſe ages. Pſammetichus had, not long before, beſieged Azotus 29 years; and Nebuchadnezzar, not long after, beſieged Tyre 13 years: even Jeruſalem was beſieged by him near 2 years before it was taken under Zedekiah; what length of ſiege then might be reaſonably expected from the greateſt and ſtrongeſt city in the world? Xenophon does not inform us how long he ſuppoſed this ſiege to continue; but he ſufficiently indicates that it was not expected to be taken in leſs than a year, when he ſays, "that Cyrus ſeparated his army into twelve parts, that each portion might be employed in the ſiege one month in their turn." Some other circumſtances indicate alſo, that if it was not taken in the Auguſt of the ſame year in which it was beſieged, it could not be taken until the following Auguſt:

Auguſt: for from the paſſage of the prophet* compared with the paſſage quoted above from Athenæus (p. 203) and the concurrent teſtimonies of Herodotus and Xenophon, that Babylon was taken on the day of a great feſtival, it has been juſtly concluded, that the capture was at the *Sacea* in Auguſt, which anſwers to the 16th of the month Lous, according to the diſpoſition of the Macedonian months in the Chaldæo-Macedonian calendar eſtabliſhed at Babylon after its capture by Alexander. Now when the ſun approaches the northern tropic, it melts the ſnows in the mountains of Armenia; which cauſes the Euphrates to overflow its banks in June and July, and to ſubſide again in Auguſt. But Herodotus obſerves, that when Cyrus had made a cut from the river to let off the waters, "if the Babylonians had been ſenſible by their own obſervation, or by report from others of the diminution in the depth of the river, they might eaſily have fruſtrated his ſtratagem by ſhutting the gates of the walls, which lined the banks of the river within the city; whereas they having no intimation of ſuch a decreaſe, and it being a feſtival day, the gates were

* "How is Sheſhach taken!" *Jerem.* li. 41.

left

left open:"* he adds alſo, "that the Perſians were only up to the middle of their thighs in the river." Theſe circumſtances ſeem to indicate, that the Babylonians muſt have been accuſtomed to a natural decreaſe of the waters in their river at the ſeaſon when Cyrus took the city; at leaſt the natural decreaſe of them in Auguſt would have given Cyrus a better proſpect of concealing his ſtratagem than at any other ſeaſon, and on this concealment, as we ſee, the whole ſucceſs depended. If we may believe Xenophon, the depth of the Euphrates there was ſometimes greater than the height of two men†: he mentions alſo, "that the canal, which Cyrus dug, was a work of ſo great labour and time, that he ſeparated his army into 12 parts, in order that each part might be relieved after one month from the duty of guarding his towers and trenches."

* Babylonii ſi factum Cyri prius aut audiſſent aut ſenſiſſent, haud dubie contempto eorum ingreſſu, peſſimo exitio affeciſſent; nam obſeratis omnibus, quæ ad flumen ferunt portulis, conſcenſis que ſeptis, ipſi pro ripis ſtantes, illos progreſſos veluti Cavea excepiſſent: nunc exinopinato eis Perſæ aſtiterunt.—Forte dies Feſtus erat:—Perſæ mediorum Femorum tenus ad ſummum fortiter Babylonem introierunt. *Lib.* 1.

† Tanta ejus profunditas, ut ne duo quidem viri, alter alteri inſiſtentes, ſupra aquam exſtare poſſint. *Lib.* 7.——In partes 12 exercitum diviſit, ut pars quælibet unum anni menſem in excubiis eſſet. *Ibid.*

All

All theſe particulars combined ſufficiently prove that Cyrus could not have taken the city in the Auguſt of the ſame year, in which he gained his victory; therefore not until near the end of his 2d year in the Chaldæan æra at ſooneſt; ſo that the greateſt part of his firſt year after the capture of Babylon would fall upon the 212th Chaldæan year, which was the 536th year before Chriſt. Now we have no reaſon to think, that the authors of the Jewiſh ſcriptures affixed any other meaning to the *firſt* of Cyrus, than that of his *firſt year* after *the capture of Babylon*; this being indeed to the Jews the firſt year, in which they were ſenſible of the difference between being ſhut up at Babylon in ſlavery to their old maſters, and being permitted by their new conquerors to return home to Judæa: after their return, they could have no cauſe or inclination to enquire in what manner Chaldæan hiſtorians and chronologers in future times dated theſe events, and whether they reckoned the firſt of Cyrus to commence at his great victory or at the capture of Babylon; the Jews would naturally ſpeak and write agreeably to their own feelings and experience of a change in their condition from ſlavery to liberty.

We

We have alſo ſufficient proofs in other places, that no ſuch hiſtoric and chronologic preciſion is to be expected from the authors of the Jewiſh ſcriptures, as that they ſhould expreſs themſelves always in ſcrupulous conformity to the vulgar method of reckoning employed in Chaldæa; ſo that they did but expreſs themſelves agreeably to the truth of facts to which they were witneſſes, and in a manner intelligible to their own countrymen in that age for whoſe information they wrote, altho' it ſhould prove vague and ambiguous to future readers: thus accordingly it is only in one place, that the Jewiſh ſacred authors call this *firſt* year in queſtion, *the firſt of Cyrus King of Babylon*; in all other places it is termed *the firſt year of Cyrus King of Perſia*; which vague expreſſion ſo miſled the moſt learned of the antient Chriſtians, Africanus, Clemens and Euſebius, that they all ſuppoſed it to mean the firſt year, in which Cyrus became King of Perſia and Media, and which was 20 years before his conqueſt of Babylon. On the contrary, the author of Daniel calls Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon before he had aſcended the throne*, namely in the third year of Jehoiakim; which is a common and natural miſ-

* Dan. c. 1. v. 1.

take through anticipation, even in learned Greek and Roman authors; for he became King of Babylon ſoon after, and in the very next year: ſeveral Roman authors in like manner call Scipio by the name of Africanus in relating actions done by him long before he had obtained that additional title†. There was ſtill a farther reaſon, why the Jews might not conſider the Babylonian kingdom to be at an end until after the capture of Babylon; for it appears from the relation of Beroſus, that the laſt Chaldæan King Nabonadius was ſtill in poſſeſſion of the city of Borſippa, where he ſuſtained a ſhort ſiege, after the capture of Babylon, before he fell into the hands of Cyrus‡. Thus then it is plain, that the prophecy of Jeremiah was ſufficiently and indeed fully completed: for even by the reckoning of the Chaldæan æra, there were 70 years from the capture of Jeruſalem in the year before the acceſſion of Nebuchadnezzar, down to the firſt year of Cyrus after the capture of Babylon, both extremes included; and the ancients for the

† Val. Maxim. Pliny, and Cicero.

‡ Cyrus autem reverſus eſt ad Borſippum, Nabonidum expugnaturus; Nabonido vero oppugnationem non expectante, ſed prius ſupplicante, uſus clementiâ Cyrus, et dans ei habitaculum in Carmenia, expulit eum e Babylonia. *Joſeph. adv. Ap. l.* 1.

moſt

moſt part reckoned incluſively, both of the year *from* which they computed, and of that *to* which they reckoned; inſtances of which may be ſeen in ſome Jewiſh computations likewiſe in Joſephus. But if any one ſhould think it requiſite to extend this period ſtill more, it muſt be remembered, that we are not certain, whether the conqueſt of Judæa might not precede the acceſſion of Nebuchadnezzar more than one year (of this however more hereafter); neither are we certain whether the ſiege of Babylon might not have laſted more than one year: and if theſe conſiderations ſhould not ſupply ſufficient means to extend this period, or any one ſhould think it neceſſary to reckon in the more minute, tho' leſs judicious manner of Prideaux, by completing the 70 years even to a month*, the computation of them may be continued down to the arrival of the Jews in Judæa, and even to the laying of the foundation of a new temple in the 2nd year after their arrival†. It may be obſerved moreover, that Ezra himſelf ſeems

* "If to 69 years and 2 months you add 10 months more to compleat the 70 years, it will carry down the end of the captivity exactly into the ſame month, in which it began—the 9th Jewiſh month, which is our November. *Prid. at year* 538.

† Ezra c. 3. 8.

to teſtify that he meant by the firſt of Cyrus, the year after *the capture of Babylon*, for he relates that Cyrus ſaid, "the Lord hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth;" he could not with any propriety have ſaid this before the capture of Babylon, for until the ſucceſs of his ſtratagem, as Herodotus informs us, he was *ſo much at his wit's end, ſince none of his attempts had hitherto proſpered, that he doubted of ſucceſs* *. Where then is that pretended *neceſſity* of corrupting the Chaldæan æra, which Bengelius pretends, and to which all Hiſtorians and Chronologers have accordingly ſubmitted? on the contrary we have found that it naturally agrees with the dates of Scripture, as ſoon as the right method of reckoning by that æra is applied to the relations of Beroſus, Herodotus and the Jewiſh Scriptures.

Having thus fixed the capture of Babylon to the right year, and by this means ſhewn, that the 4th of Jehoiakim in courſe becomes cotemporary with the 1ſt of Nebuchadnezzar, agreeably to the words of Scripture;

* Κυρος τε απορησι ενειχετο, ἀτε χρονε εγγινομενε συχνε, ανωτερω δε ουδεν των πραγματων προκοπτομενων. *Lib.* 1. Cyrus, quum jam longo tempore nihil admodum res ipſius proficerent, inops conſilii erat.

theſe

theſe dates* fix all the ſuperior Jewiſh kings to right Chaldæan dates, and hence rightly connect them with the æra of Olympiads, and with the line of Perſian and Median kings, which latter is the next article for our conſideration: and herein we ſhall again find, that all chronologers have run up the commencement of the Median kingdom ſeveral years too high, or elſe on the contrary have brought it down as much too low; but which when fixed agreeably to the real dates and method of reckoning by prophane authors, without being deranged by the ſyſtematic errors of antient Chriſtians, or the fanciful conjectures of modern ones, will be found to harmonize ſo accurately with the line of Jewiſh events, as fixed already, that they will mutually confirm each other's dates and veracity.

* Scaliger had long ago pointed out the way to theſe right dates, "Victo Nabonido non ſtatim fuiſſe potitum Babylone teſtis Herodotus—ſed *multum poſt* temporis—tunc vere completi ſunt 70 Anni Captivitatis, Ann: Nab. 217. *Notæ ad Fragm. p.* 16. He placed indeed this capture too late; Petavius ran into the oppoſite extreme in fixing it at 210. *lib.* 10. *c.* 15. Uſher, Prideaux, Univ. Hiſt: and Blair followed Petavius.

That

That all Chronologers have embraced falſe principles in putting together the years aſcribed to the Kings of Media before Cyrus, and ſome Kings of Perſia after him; whereby they have run up the Median Kings too high; or elſe brought them down too low, juſt as they preferred Herodotus or Cteſias.

THE next ſubject for our reſearches reſpects the line of Perſian Kings, before the invaſion of Greece in the 6th year of Xerxes, and our firſt enquiry is with what Olympic year the 2nd of Darius his predeceſſor was conumerary. Now ſince the 6th of Xerxes in the Chaldæan æra was conumerary with the firſt of 75th Olymp, it follows that according to the length of reign aſcribed to Darius in that æra, the 2nd of Darius muſt be conumerary with the firſt of 65th Olympiad, but would begin 6 months before this Olympic year; it would then coincide altogether with the conumerary Julian year before Chriſt; for the 1ſt year of Darius commenced on the 1ſt of January*. Euſebius alſo, according to the

* It may be proper to obſerve, that in the firſt of Darius 2 Chaldæan years began in the ſame Julian year, the 227th on the 1ſt of January and the 228th on the 31ſt of December following; before this date the

Latin tranſlation by St. Jerom, as before mentioned (p. 138.) rightly makes 548 years between the 15th of Tiberius and the 2nd of Darius: the 15th of Tiberius was conumerary with the 4th year of 201ſt Olympiad, as Euſebius partly mentions, and as all the beſt Chronologers agree in *. From 201 Olymp, deduct 64 Olymp, there remain 137 Olympiads equal to 548 years; here then we ſee, that Euſebius alſo reckoned incluſively of the two extreme years, *from* which and *to* which he computed: he therefore rightly alſo places the 2nd of Darius on the 1ſt year of 65th Olympiad, as all other Chronologers have done ſince†:

the Chaldæan year which began in any Julian year, is alſo the year conumerary with it, and as ſuch is rightly placed in Petavius's tables, lib. 13. of *Doctr. Temp.* but by his placing both theſe Chaldæan years in the ſame Julian year, becauſe they both *began* in it, hence no Chaldæan year afterwards placed there againſt any Julian year, is the year conumerary with it, but contains an unit more than the reſpectively conumerary year. Blair more juſtly has marked the conumerary years throughout; ſo that there is no real difference of reckoning between him and Petavius in this point but only an apparent one thus cauſed by their following different methods. *See p.* 126.

* Vide Petavius, L'Art de verifier les Dates, and Pagi.

† Darii ſecundus annus 65 Olymp anno primo fuit, et Tiberii 15tus in ducenteſimam *primam* Olymp in currit:

to this date in his preface his Chronicon agrees, and he repeats it in his *Prep. Ev. l.* 10. But altho' Euſebius is right in this *general* ſum; and even in this *particular* date, yet it will be found, that he has neither given the right lengths to ſeveral of the following reigns in Perſia, nor yet to the preceding ones; with only the latter of which however we have at preſent any concern. This date of Darius's 2d year may therefore be conſidered as a ſecond ſecure foundation date, which both gives and receives confirmation from the date of the invaſion of Xerxes; and alſo ſhews the propriety of our ſelecting theſe as the foundation of our enquiries; ſince if we advance almoſt a ſingle ſtep either upward or downward, we fall into error or uncertainty at leaſt: for not only Euſebius, but alſo Greek hiſtorians and modern chronologers have made as many errors in ſome of the dates of Perſian reigns and events afterwards as they have in thoſe before; juſt as if they in courſe ran the more into error, the farther

currit: fiunt ergo inter Darium et Tiberium Olympiades 137, anni 548. *Euſeb. Præfat.* Inſtead of *primam* the editions have *decimam* or in figures 210, the former error probably aroſe from the latter, 210 being printed for 201, as the other numbers plainly prove; poſſibly it is corrected in the ſcarce edition of Pontacus by MSS, as it is in that of Scaliger by conjecture.

they

they receded from thoſe two ſelf-felt and memorable events in the Grecian annals, the invaſions of Greece by Darius and Xerxes. An error of 5 or 6 years will be found made by Diodorus, Euſebius and all modern chronologers ſince in the memorable conqueſt of Sidon and Egypt by Ochus King of Perſia, it being placed too early; and a contrary error of 3 years in the former conqueſt of Egypt by Cambyſes, it being too late. Diodorus and Euſebius probably copied theſe errors from Ephorus, Timæus or ſome popular Greek hiſtorian. It is alſo well known, that an error was made by moſt Greek hiſtorians in regard to the flight of Themiſtocles to Perſia; which they ſay was during the reign of Xerxes, inſtead of full 5 years later and during the reign of Artaxerxes. If the Greeks were ſo negligent of Perſian hiſtory and chronology, as to commit ſuch errors during their moſt civilized times, what dependence can we place upon their dates of Aſiatic events before the age of Xerxes, in preference to the original Aſiatic æra in queſtion? when they agree with it, they confirm it; but when they do not, we ought to depend on that in preference to them: However in the preſent caſe, Herodotus, Euſebius, Manetho, Syncellus, the Paſchal Chronicon and all others agree with this æra in giving 36 years to

Darius; except indeed Cteſias whoſe account in the extract from him by Photius allows only 31 years to this reign; but why Cteſias was forced to abridge it, and how little dependance can be placed upon him we ſhall have farther occaſion to obſerve. The Parian Marbles alſo poſſibly, tho' not certainly, place the *real* acceſſion of Darius very nearly if not exactly right: for the laſt figures of the date there, viz. III might, as Prideaux obſerves, have formerly been III (i. e. 6.) by the croſs ſtroke being now worn away; which would make the whole date 256 inſtead of 253, as former critics had read it: and this would make his acceſſion to be conumerary with the 1ſt year of the 65th Olymp, which was the Chaldæan year 228, therefore only one year later than in the Chaldæan æra wherein he commences in 227: but then it muſt be remembered, that his firſt year in this æra begins as far back as from the New Year's Day before his acceſſion, and includes all the intervening odd months of his predeceſſor the Magian Smerdis which fell after that New Year's Day; ſo that Darius might poſſibly not accede long before the 31ſt of December, at which his 2d year the 228th of the Chaldæan æra commenced, alſo the 256th year before the

the laſt date of the Parian Marbles*. The commencement of this reign is alſo farther confirmed by the dates of two eclipſes obſerved at Babylon, as given by Hipparchus and preſerved by Ptolomey, one in the 20th, and the other in the 31ſt year of Darius†; the former of which he calls the 246th year, and the latter the 257th; but which Jackſon's pretendedly *true account* makes to be 248 and 259. Vol. I. p. 454.

We can now advance with more ſecurity to the preceding reign of *Cambyſes*, in which doubt and diſſenſion again begin to be introduced, but increaſe as we aſcend higher up: the Chaldæan æra gives 8 years to this reign; but Cteſias allows 18‡: this is ſuch an extravagant error in ſo ſhort a reign, that no modern author has followed it; and ſuch an error ſo ſoon before the age of Xerxes ſhews it to be but a falſe pretence, that he was ever admitted to the Archives in Per-

* Notæ Hiſtor. ad Par. Marm. by Prideaux, Epoch. 45.

† Ελαβομεν δη πρωτην μεν εκλειψιν την τε Δαρειε τε πρωτε τετηρημενην εν Βαβυλωνι τω πρωτω και λ'αυτε ἑιει —— και ὁ απο Ναβονασαρου χρονος συναγει ἑιη σνς, και ἡμερας ρκβ. —— Δευτερα δε, ἡ και Ιππαρχος συνεχρησατο, γεγενημενη τω κ ἑιει Δαρειου του μετα Καμβυσου —— ὁ δε απο της εποχης χρονος ἑιων εστι σμε και ἡμερων τκζ. *Lib.* 4.

‡ Βασιλευσας δυοιν δεοντα εικοσι *Extract: in Photii Biblioth. num.* 72.

ſia during his reſidence there, as Phyſician to Artaxerxes II*. Neither has any antient hiſtorian now extant followed Cteſias in this ſum; yet it was probably this erroneous ſum of reign in Cteſias, which gave riſe to that later and well known error of Diodorus and others in making Themiſtocles flee to Perſia during the reign of Xerxes, that is, 5 years too early; for if that exceſs of 10 years under Cambyſes was carried downward, Xerxes's reign muſt have been depreſſed 10 years *too low*; which would neceſſarily place the flight of Themiſtocles, if fixed to its right Olympic date, 10 years *too high* in the Perſian line of reigns, and thereby make it fall in the reign of Xerxes. However Cteſias had himſelf in part removed the effect of this error in the reign of Darius, by allowing him only 31 years inſtead of 36; this cut off 5 out of the 10 years of error; but if Ephorus, Timæus, or any other hiſtorian after Cteſias, followed

* Cteſias, qui apud regem Artaxerxem ſummo cum honore fuit, ex Annalibus Regum, inquibus priſca Perſarum geſta, obſervata conſuetudine, ſcripta erant, certam a ſe compertam Hiſtoriam affirmat, *Diod.* 3. 9. The account of Photius is more probable, "that as Cteſias aſſerted, moſt of what he delivered, he either ſaw himſelf, or heard himſelf from the Perſians, and thus formed his hiſtory". Πλειονων ἁ ιστορει αυτοπτην γενομενον, η παρ' αυτων Περσων αυτηκοον καταστaντα, ουτω την ιστοριαν συγγραψαι.

him

him in giving alſo 18 to Cambyſes, hereby an error of 5 years would ſtill be carried downwards, and produce that error concerning Themiſtocles; whoſe flight tho' Charon† and Thucydides his cotemporaries had placed right, yet moſt moderns as well as antients, have diſplaced: the hint then I have given, concerning the origin of this difference among antient hiſtorians in regard to the date of this event, confirms the correction which Dodwell had before recommended, by bringing down this flight 5 years lower in the Olympic æra; it being raiſed too high in this by Diodorus, becauſe Ephorus had raiſed it too high in the Perſian reigns. Another error probably ariſing from the ſame cauſe, ſubſiſts alſo in Uſher, Prideaux, Blair and all others, in placing the conqueſt of Sidon by Ochus too high likewiſe. But as theſe effects of this error under Cambyſes tend downward, they no otherwiſe concern us at preſent than as examples how an error in one reign is communicated to others either above or below; whence we ſee the

† Plutarch *Themiſt:* where he ſays alſo "that Ephorus and many others had fallen into the above error"; which proves that Ephorus miſled Diodorus, and Cteſias Ephorus: Petavius and Uſher increaſe it to 9 years, in order to favor their ſenſe of Daniel's Prophecy. *See Prid. ann.* 471 *and* 458.—*Thucyd. l.* 1.

neceſſity

neceſſity of ſearching out an original error, leſt it be only ſhifted from place to place; and as conſpicuous proofs alſo, how little reliance is to be placed on Cteſias in more early ages, if he was capable to commit an error of 10 years in a ſhort reign, only 100 years before his own time, in an intelligent age, and another of 5 years ſtill later. It is to his romancing hiſtory, and the hiſtorical romance of Xenophon, that we are indebted for moſt of thoſe errors which have produced confuſion in Aſiatic Chronology; their dates as well as relations having been adopted by future antient hiſtorians as real truths, and not even yet rejected again in either caſe by the moderns; ſo fondly do mankind embrace the errors of their forefathers! For that ſome antient hiſtorians, now-periſhed, had adopted this error of Cteſias under Cambyſes, appears from Clemens Alexand. who refers to an anonymous computer, later than the age of Cteſias himſelf, as giving 19 years to Cambyſes (Strom. 1.); and that other hiſtorians had embraced the political and military proluſions of Xenophon as containing true hiſtory, we ſhall ſee afterwards: even in the preſent times Hutchinſon and many others are found gravely arguing for the veracity of this romance; an extravagance into which they probably would have never fallen, if

they

they had not thought that this romance corresponded better to the Jewsh Scriptures than true history; which is as great an error as the other, so much does zeal often out run discretion!*

But there is also a farther error, altho' a less one, concerning this reign of Cambyses transmitted down from antiquity, and still retained by modern chronologers, the effect of which on the contrary tends upward, and raises the commencement of Cyrus too high; which however we are also enabled to correct by attention to the right method of reckoning in the Chaldæan æra, and by that only. This arises from the odd months of Cyrus, Cambyses, Smerdis and others, some or all of which we shall find, that our chronologers have reckoned up twice. Now here occurs the *second* of the *two cases* (mentioned at p. 220.) in which that single rule, there delivered for right reckoning in the æra, is not sufficient; from that rule it followed, that all odd months of reign above complete years are invariably included in the first year of the successor: But here occurs the case of a

* L'Abbè Banier dans le 2 vol. des *Memoires de l'Academie*, cite des Ecrivains *judicieux*, qui ont preferé Xenophon à Herodote sur ce qui concerne Cyrus, le trouvant plus conformé á l'Ecriture sainte. *Journ. des Scavans*, 1777.

king,

king, Smerdis the Magian, who reigned 7 months only between Cambyſes and Darius; a queſtion then ariſes, does *this caſe* follow the former rule, and are theſe 7 months in like manner included in the firſt year of Darius the ſucceſſor, or on the contrary in the laſt of Cambyſes? I obſerved before, that as Dodwell had juſtly contended, the æra omits the name of every king, who reigned leſs than a complete Chaldæan year, yet includes the ſum of their reigns:* We have ſeen the truth of this fact in the caſe of Laboroſo archod mentioned by Beroſus above; we find here again that the name of Smerdis is omitted; the ſame omiſſion occurs of the name of Artabanus, who reigned 7 months after Xerxes; and of Xerxes 2d, and Sogdi-

* *Laboroſoarchum* meminit Beroſus, in noſtro canone omiſſum; verum id pro more fecit noſter: qui *integrum annum* non explerent, eorum nunquam meminit, ita tamen ut numero *univerſo* nihil pereat, nempe eorum tempora aliorum principum *diuturniorum* temporibus accenſens, *Sect.* 26.——Ita *Magorum* menſes omiſſi, aliorumque regum menſes et dies, nihil tamen impediunt, quo minus in *ſumma* optime conveniant: eſt que id obſervatione digniſſimum in toto hoc regum canone ne unum equidem hic comparere, qui non *ſpatium annuum* expleverit, nec tamen propterea minus inter ſe convenire annorum *integra intervalla*. Aliunde itaque neceſſe eſt ut defectus ſarciantur, quod tamen *veris* regum temporibus fieri omnino non potuit. *ſect.* 36.

anus,

anus who reigned together 8 months after Artaxerxes the Firſt; and under the æra of Philip the names of the Roman emperors, Galba Otho and Vitellius are omitted, who reigned all together 1 year and 1 month after Nero, altho' each leſs than a year ſeparately. The laſt example alſo afforded Dodwell a good opportunity of proving with certainty, that none of theſe odd months are omitted in reckoning, altho' the names of the emperors are omitted (ſect. 38); which is indeed the only example throughout both æras, wherein it can be proved ſo clearly; becauſe in this hiſtorians have tranſmitted the dates of the Julian months, at which theſe 3 omitted emperors acceded and died. But from hence it follows, that the antient chriſtians, Africanus, Euſebius, Syncellus, muſt have reckoned up twice theſe odd months of Smerdis and others; ſince they allow the full numbers of the Chaldæan æra, namely 8 to Cambyſes, and 36 to Darius, and yet ſum up alſo and include in their reckoning the total amount of the odd months of Smerdis and others. Euſebius particularly even allows a whole year to Smerdis, or what is the ſame, reckons the 2d of Darius twice*;

* Hic ſecundusannus bis ponitur, quia unus in Magorum 7 menſibus computatur. *ad Olymp.* 65.

he had his reaſon however for giving into this error; for otherwiſe he could not raiſe up the firſt of Cyrus over Perſia ſo high as the beginning of the 55th Olymp, where Diodorus had erroneouſly fixed it too high; and this error was uſeful to the purpoſe of Euſebius, as was alſo the error of Cteſias in giving 30 years to Cyrus inſtead of 29, which Euſebius adopts likewiſe: for he having determined, as we mentioned p. 138, to place the deſtruction of the temple full 70 years before the 2d of Darius, thro' his miſtaking the meaning of Zechariah; hereby he raiſed the 11th and laſt of Zedekiah, in which the temple was deſtroyed, ſo high (5 years too high) that there would have been 74 years from the 13th of Joſiah excluſively down to the firſt of Cyrus over Perſia, unleſs he had thus raiſed the latter reign 2 years too high alſo: by which means he reduced the period to 72; for he erroneouſly ſuppoſed this period to be what Jeremiah alluded to in his prophecy of 70 years. Modern commentators alſo have often, like Euſebius, firſt put erroneous conſtructions upon the words of Scripture, and then deranged the dates of events, in order to juſtify their own ſuppoſitions. But altho' the moderns by having underſtood the prophecy of Jeremiah in a more juſt ſenſe, have no longer any occaſion for this error of

raiſing

raiſing up the firſt of Cyrus too high, yet they have ſtill continued the error in part*, that is, with reſpect to one year out of the two; becauſe it ſeemed to them to be juſtified by Herodotus, and Diodorus. Let us then examine, whether theſe hiſtorians may not be both illuſtrated by the ſurer evidence of the Chaldæan æra; this date of the firſt of Cyrus on the firſt year of the 55th Olymp, being one of the chief principles, by which chronologers fix all ſuperior reigns in Media†; therefore the firſt cauſe of error in thoſe, who run up the Median kingdom too high‡, by pretending to follow Herodotus: while others bring it down too low in pretending to follow Cteſias§; and no one has followed Euſebius, who has gone in the middle of both extremes; between whoſe date alſo and the *real* ones of Herod and Cteſias there is no difference whatever.

* See p. 139.

† Chronologiæ totius cardinem ac fundamentum Cyri primordia continent, a quibus et antecedentium fere temporum et poſteriorum ratio, et omnis fere ſacræ hiſtoriæ cum profana concordia dependet —— nihil tanto chronologorum omnium veterum, perinde ac recentiorum conſenſione ſtabilitum eſt, ac Epocha Cyri; nullus enim ex antiquis Olympiade 55 Cyrum Perſis regnare cæpiſſe non prodidit, et quidem ineunte; hoc eſt ut agon ipſe in annum illius primum incurrerit. *Petav. Doct. Tempor.* 10. 13 and 14. *& Scalig. lib.* 5.

‡ Syncellus, Calviſius, Uſher, Prideaux, Univ. Hiſt.

§ Petavius, Vignoles, Jackſon, Blair.

That the odd Months of any King, whoſe name is omitted in the Chaldæan æra, are not (as Dodwell and others ſuppoſe) always included in the laſt year of the predeceſſor; but are juſt as often included in the firſt of the ſucceſſor, or elſe are divided between the two in different proportions, according to the following accidental circumſtances, whether the omitted king happened to accede ſoon before, or to die ſoon after the Chaldæan New Year's Day.

ALTHOUGH modern chronologers have not *in general* adopted the error of antient Chriſtian ones, by reckoning up twice all the odd months of theſe omitted kings, yet they have fallen into a ſimilar one, which produces a ſimilar conſequence in the *particular* caſes of Smerdis and Cyrus; for by underſtanding in a falſe ſenſe the words of Herodotus,* they have all included the 7 months of Smerdis within the laſt year of Cambyſes: but if it ſhall be found, that according to the method of the Chaldæan æra, thoſe 7 months might have juſt as well been included in the firſt year of Darius, and from other circumſtances that

* Smerdis regnavit menſes 7, qui reliqui ſunt ad implendum 8m. ann. Cambyſis. Lib. 3.

there

there is every reaſon to think they actually were included in the latter, it hence follows that they have been reckoned up twice by our chronologers: a like double reckoning of 6 months more will be found alſo at the end of Cyrus's reign; whereby it will appear that his acceſſion has been placed 1 year too high in our modern ſyſtems, and 2 years too high by the antients; and hence ſome incoherences have in conſequence been occaſioned both above and below. Now in order to prove this, it muſt be obſerved, that in the foregoing quotations from Dodwell, he has gone no farther, than only to ſhew, that the odd months of omitted kings are included *ſomewhere* in the adjacent reigns, and he has not determined in which of them, whether in that of the adjacent predeceſſor or of the ſucceſſor. Afterwards however he proceeds to the determination of this point likewiſe, when he comes to conſider the example of the three ſucceſſive and omitted Emperors Galba, Otho, and Vitellius; and he ſhews, that in *this example* the laſt year of their predeceſſor Nero did not end, agreeably to our above rule, at the Egyptian New Year's Day *next before* his death, but went down as far as to the New Year's Day *next after*

after his death†; but hence, when he goes on to consider the example of the Emperor *Macrinus*, he forms this erroneous general rule, "that in the case of odd months of any omitted kings they are always included under the last year of the *predecessor*, not under the first of the successor."‡ This

† Neroni cum assignantur anni 14, necesse est ut Thoth anni dom. 68 ei tribuatur, propter tumultus reipublicæ: nec enim succedentium principum quispiam annum integrum explevit usque ad Vespasianum —non tamen illum [Thoth anni 68] attigit Nero, occisus Jun. 9; Thoth enim illius anni incidit in Aug. 6. *sect.* 38.

‡ Caracallæ pertingit Thoth anni dom. 217, et tamen certum est Thoth illum non attigisse Caracallam: occisus est Caracalla ineunte Aprili, Thoth fuit Jun. 30; nemper *Macrini* fuit hic Thoth, qui licet annum integrum absolverit, nullus tamen in hoc nostro canone comparet: numeravit hîc pro more suo canon: cum enim præessent id genus principes qui nec rempublicam haberent pacatam, nec imperium ad hæredes transmiserint, nec diu etiam ipsi imperarint; non ipsis solet, sed vero *eorum Decessoribus*, eorum quoque tempora imputare. Exemplum in Nerone jam vidimus, *cui* illius anni Thoth, quo imperarint Galba, Otho et Vitellius, canon tamen similiter annumeravit.——Proximus Thoth anni 218 de jure debetur Elagabalo: victus enim est ab eo Macrinus Jun. 3, ante Thoth Jun. 30. *sect.* 51.

As the æra of Philip has been often published, it seemed needless to include it here on account of these few dates by it; it may be seen in *Calvisius*, or at the end of Petavius's *Rationarium*, and in *Whiston's short View of Chron.* also at the end of Bainbridge's *Sphæra Procli*;

erroneous rule poſſibly helped to miſlead Mr. Allin and Prideaux as above-mentioned; who from the particular caſe of ſuch omitted kings extended this general rule to all caſes of odd months, even when there is no king omitted: yet even in this particular

Procli; in *Dodw. Diſſert. Cyprian.* and in Vignole's *Chron. ſacrèe, livre* 5. In all of them Nero's reign ends with the year 391 of the æra of Philip, to which adding the 424 years of the Chaldæan æra, they amount to 815; from theſe deduct 268 our foundation date, there remain 547 Chaldæan years down from thence excluſively unto the end of Nero: but 480 being the year before Chriſt conumerary with the Chaldæan year 268, on deducting 479 Julian years from 547 Chaldæan ones, there remain 68, therefore the 815th Chaldæan year muſt be conumerary with the 68th year after Chriſt. Now as the 268th began on Dec. 21 before the 480th year before Chriſt, therefore if Chaldæan and Julian years had been equal, the 815th would have ended on Dec. 21 before the end of the 68th Chriſtian year; but becauſe the Chaldæan year had been during this interval retrograde, the 815th had got back as far as to the 6th of Auguſt, at which day it ended in the 68th year of Chriſt: conſequently ſince the 815th Chaldæan year (the 391ſt in the æra of Philip) is marked as being the laſt of Nero, his laſt year is reckoned down to the 6th of Auguſt, after his death; for he died on the 9th of June before in 68. Veſpaſian acceded on the 1ſt of July in the year 69, and with the 816th Chaldæan year, therefore his 1ſt Chaldæan year commences on Auguſt 6th in the year 68, and includes all the odd months of Galba (who reigned 7 months) except the 2 firſt, as well as the 3 of Otho, and 3 of Vitellius.

caſe

caſe it is evident from the very words of Dodwell himſelf, that the whole of it is a falſe concluſion, and that no ſuch rule can be drawn from the very examples under conſideration. For as the reigns of Galba, Otho and Vitellius contained together 1 year and 1 month, the whole could not poſſibly be included under either the laſt year of the predeceſſor Nero or the firſt of the ſucceſſor Veſpaſian, but muſt have been divided between them; and in this example the far greater portion fell to the ſhare of the *ſucceſſor*: becauſe if "Nero died June the 9th; and the Egyptian New Year's Day fell in that year upon the 6th of Auguſt, and Nero's laſt year went down to this 6th of Auguſt, in the year of Chriſt 68"; ſtill it would include only 2 months out of the 13 months in queſtion; and the firſt year of Veſpaſian, who acceded on July the 1ſt in the next year 69, muſt have included all the remaining 11 months, beginning at the above 6th of Auguſt next *before* his acceſſion and at which the reign of Nero ended. Hence then it appears, that the rule, which Dodwell ought to have drawn from this example, is very different from what he has drawn: for he ought to have concluded hence, that in *this caſe alſo* of the odd months of a ſingle omitted king, or ſeveral ſucceſſive kings

of

of ſo ſhort reigns each, as to be leſs than a year ſeparately, ſtill the *ſame rule* holds good, as in the caſe of the odd months of any predeceſſor above a complete year, viz. " that the ſucceſſor, as Veſpaſian for inſtance, does in this caſe alſo begin his firſt year at the New Year's Day next *before* his acceſſion, agreeably to our *former rule*; but if he ſhould not hereby include all ſuch odd months of ſhort reigns, then and then only the predeceſſor's laſt year goes down ſo low as to include the remainder"; thus they divide the odd months between them, and a larger or leſs portion will fall to the *ſucceſſor's* ſhare, according as he happened to accede at a greater or leſs diſtance from that New Year's Day *next preceding*. So that there is no variation from *our firſt* rule in this or in *any caſe whatever*; for each reign in all caſes invariably commences at the beginning of that year, which was *current* when the king acceded; but in caſe he does not hereby include all the odd months of ſhort reigns before his acceſſion, then in order to preſerve inviolate alſo the *other rule* of omitting every reign leſs than a year, the predeceſſor extends his reign down to the New Year's Day next *after* his own death, inſtead of ending as in an ordinary caſe at the New Year *before* his death. Now that this is the right concluſion,

which Dodwell ought to have drawn from this example, and this the real method of reckoning obſerved in the æra of Philip is farther confirmed by that other example of the Emperor *Macrinus* (whoſe name is alſo omitted) and whence Dodwell again erroneouſly concludes the contrary. For he there obſerves, " that *Caracalla* was ſlain in the beginning of April in the 217th year of Chriſt; that the Egyptian New Year's Day fell on the following 30th of June; and that Macrinus was conquered on the 3d of June in the following year 218, therefore before the Egyptian New Year's Day on the 30th of June in that year": conſequently Macrinus reigned 2 months more than 1 year altho' his name is omitted; but as he loſt the empire 27 days before the Egyptian New Year, all this *current* year was according to Dodwell himſelf included in the firſt of the ſucceſſor Elagabalus; accordingly this current year (the 541ſt) is marked as his firſt in the æra, and actually comprehended all the odd months of Macrinus except thoſe firſt 3 between the beginning of April and the 30th of June. The laſt year therefore of the predeceſſor Caracalla, by going down to the *following* 30th of June after his death included only 3 months more than his *real* reign; and thus it appears that the far greater

portion

portion of the omitted reign of Macrinus in this ſecond example fell again to the ſhare of *the ſucceſſor*, not as Dodwell had affirmed, to that of the *predeceſſor**. Why Macrinus was omitted, altho' he reigned more than a year, I cannot pretend to determine, but moſt probably becauſe he had never (I believe) been properly acknowledged as Emperor by the Senate, people and Prætorian guards at Rome; for he aſſumed the empire to himſelf in Syria, where

* The date of the laſt year of Severus and Caracalla (as colleagues) is in all editions of the æra of Philip 540; to which adding the ſum of the Chaldæan æra 424, they amount to 964; whence deducting, as before, 268, there remain 696 Chaldæan years, between the 6th of Xerxes excluſively and the laſt year of theſe emperors incluſively; hence deducting again the 479 Julian years between 6th of Xerxes and the æra of Chriſt, there remain 217 Julian years after Chriſt: but Chaldæan years being ſhorter than Julian ones, the 540th of Philip (which is the 964th of Chaldæan æra) ended on the 30th of June in the 217th year of Chriſt; therefore the ſucceſſor Elagabalus muſt have begun to reckon his firſt year (the 541ſt) from that day, altho' he did not really obtain his victory over Macrinus until the 3d of June in the following year 218.——Theſe two examples moreover, beſides proving the points now under conſideration, manifeſt alſo at the ſame time, that the 480th year before Chriſt has been juſtly made conumerary with our foundation date 268 in the Chaldæan æra.

he remained until conquered by Elagabalus: he might be therefore conſidered as an uſurper upon the right of the Prætorian guards to elect an Emperor, and thus be excluded from being ranked among them; or poſſibly for no other reaſon, than becauſe that (as we have ſeen) the laſt year of the predeceſſor, and the firſt of the ſucceſſor were *able* in this example to include the whole reign of Macrinus by dividing it between them, notwithſtanding that in fact he reigned a longer time than 12 months; ſo that perhaps *this* ought rather to be given as *the rule* to be eſtabliſhed for judging what reigns the method of the æra excluded or included by name, and not that of Dodwell founded on the mere circumſtance of a king's having compleated 12 months or not. Yet Nerva's ſhort reign is not regulated even by this rule now propoſed; for that might have been thus divided between his predeceſſor and ſucceſſor, whether we reckon the firſt year of the latter (Trajan) from the day of his acceſſion, or from that of his adoption; nevertheleſs Nerva has 1 year of reign aſſigned to him in the æra of Philip. Upon the whole then we may agree with Dodwell, that there might be *ſeveral* motives for excluding the names of kings of ſhort reigns:

reigns: but thus far at leaſt our propoſed rule will hold good, "that none were excluded, whoſe reigns could not be divided between their predeceſſor and ſucceſſor in ſome proportion or other, as in the foregoing examples"; and this proportion depended on the greater or leſs diſtance, at which a ſucceſſor acceded after a new year.

Prejudices againſt the right method of reckoning in the Chaldæan æra removed, by ſhewing the ſame to have been the general method practiced in Aſia during Roman times, as likewiſe in Egypt and elſewhere, particularly in Germany and France, even ſo late as the 966th year after Chriſt.

HAVING now gone through all articles requiſite to diſplay and aſcertain the right method of the Chaldæan æra, it only remains to remove any prejudices which may ariſe againſt it from a haſty ſuppoſition, that it is an uncommon method, and different from the practice of both Greeks and Romans, as well as all modern nations, therefore could ſcarcely have been in vulgar uſe in Chaldæa and Perſia: for the real fact is, that the very ſame method was almoſt the univerſal one prevailing in Aſia, as well as in Egypt, during the ages which followed the ruin of the

the Perſian empire by Alexander; of which ſufficient evidence is ſtill extant, both from books and medals. That I may not be thought to miſrepreſent any proofs which have occurred to myſelf, I ſhall quote the words of critics and medalliſts, who had not the leaſt idea in view of authenticating the Chaldæan æra, but of confirming very different facts. The Benedictine authors of the *Art de Verifier les Dates* obſerve, that the very ſame method (aſcribed by Dodwell, Vignoles and myſelf to the Chaldæan æra) obtained in France and Germany ſo late as the Emperor *Otto*, in the 966th year of Chriſt, and much later; and in proof of the antiquity of this method he refers to other authors in theſe words: "Although the Emperor Galba reigned leſs than a year, yet we find medals ſtruck in the 2d year of his reign. But antiquaries have obſerved, that they have been all ſtruck in the Eaſt [in Aſia or Egypt] where it was the cuſtom to reckon the years of the Roman Emperors from the firſt day of that year, *in which* they had begun to reign; and as the new year commenced about Autumn in the Eaſt [viz. in Syria, after the æra of the Seleucidæ was eſtabliſhed, and in Egypt after the introduction of the Auguſtan æra] Galba, according to this practice, lived until

after

after the beginning of a 2d year of reign": for he acceded on the 9th of June and reigned until the following 15th of January. *Chron. Emper. rom.* under *Galba.* p. 339.

Again, " we have ſeen (ſays M. du Belley) a medal of Galba ſtruck at Seleucia in Syria in the 2d year of his reign, Ετους νεου ἱερου B; yet he reigned only 9 months and 13 days, even if we reckon from the 3d of April, on which he was firſt proclaimed in Spain, before the death of Nero: the Seleucians then reckoned a 2d year of his reign to commence at the beginning of their civil year in Autumn." The practice at Tyre was the ſame. " Trajan was adopted by Nerva the 18th of Sept. 97. But on the following 19th of October, which was the firſt day of the civil year at Tyre, they reckoned a 2d year of his reign to commence; by this means, on the 19th of Oct. 116, they reckoned his 21ſt year to begin on medals [K. A.] although he did not reign 20 complete years, for he died on Aug. 10, in 117." Others, however, place his adoption ſtill later, and near the end of October: but in both examples it may be obſerved, that the computation begins as in the Chaldæan æra, as early as poſſible, that is, from the year of their adoption. " Noris has proved that the people of Antiochia and Laodicea

Laodicea in Syria, reckoned alſo a new year of reign to commence at the beginning of their civil year in ſome dates concerning Julius Cæſar. He alſo remarks with reſpect to a medal of Herod Antipas, after Kepler and Petavius, that the Jews, in like manner, reckoned the reigns of their kings from that month *Niſan* [about March] which *preceded* their acceſſion: ſo that they computed a 2d year of reign to commence at the firſt day of the following *Niſan*, however ſhort a time any king had acceded before: he proves it by a paſſage in Joſephus; and the Talmud ſays to the ſame purport; Prima dies Niſan eſt novus annus regum: annus ille eſt a quo numerare incipiebant annos regum ſuorum in Chirographis, contractibus & publicis omnibus inſtrumentis & diplomatibus, qui ad annos & menſes regum componebantur.*" *Diſſert.* 2. *Part* 2. *p.* 8. *Paris*, 1770.

* Theſe words of the Talmud, however, do not prove whether the month Niſan *before* a king's acceſſion, or *after* it, be here meant. But he adds, "By the Talmud alſo, and otherwiſe Petit has proved, that the Jews reckoned the years of Roman Emperors, and other foreign kings, from that month Tizri [about September] which *preceeded* their acceſſion, even although only a few months or a ſingle day had intervened [before another Tizri]: and the dates on medals of Philip the Tetrarch, Agrippa 1ſt. and Agrippa 2d. are reckoned in the ſame manner."

But neither the foregoing words of the Talmud, nor any of the above teſtimonies from medals*, can with any reaſon be extended farther back than only to determine what was the Jewiſh method of reckoning the reigns of foreign Kings after the commencement of the æra of Seleucidæ; for this æra began in Syria about the Jewiſh month Tizri in Autumn, and probably firſt introduced this difference in method among the Jews: neither can the practice of the Jews, with reſpect to their method of reckoning the reigns of their own Kings from Niſan, be with any certainty extended farther back than to the commencement of their ſecond race of Kings by Herod the Great; no conſequence can be drawn in either caſe

* The above medal of Herod Antipas is not now (I believe) allowed to be genuine, but the others may ſupply its place; and if otherwiſe, yet they ſtill equally indicate the ſentiments of Noris and others concerning the prevalence of this mode of reckoning in Aſia under the Roman Emperors. Petavius alſo will be found to have often adopted it even in the Roman computation of many reigns of Emperors. Valſecchi however calls this method in queſtion in his diſſertation *De Initio Imp. Severi Alexandri. Florent.* 1715: I have not had an opportunity of examining the force of his arguments; but one ſhould think that they were not very concluſive, ſince our Benedictine authors have not been convinced by them.

from theſe authorities toward determining the practice of the Jews during their firſt race of Kings before the Captivity. In regard to Egypt, the above Benedictine author obſerves, " That the ſame method of computing an Emperor's firſt year from the New Year's Day *before* his acceſſion, has been proved by Pagi to have been practiſed in Egypt in various caſes, particularly in the date of a ſecond year of reign found on medals of Galba, ſtruck there alſo as well as in Syria: and that the Baron of Baſtia has confirmed it by ſome Egyptian medals of the Emperor Probus, on which an eighth year of reign is found dated;" tho' in fact he reigned only ſix complete years and ſome odd months. Theſe authorities then muſt remove any haſty prejudice which might otherwiſe be conceived againſt our ſuppoſed vulgar uſe in Chaldæa and Perſia of that mode of reckoning adopted in the Chaldæan æra, ſo different from what is univerſally prevalent in modern times; ſince it appears that a ſimilar mode was actually in vulgar uſe both in Egypt and alſo in Syria, in the ages ſubſequent to the ruin of the Perſian Empire. Now this latter fact again contributes to confirm the originality of the Chaldæan æra in its preſent form; for although with reſpect to Egypt it may be doubtful

ful whether that nation borrowed their mode of calendar from Chaldæa, or on the contrary Chaldæa from Egypt, or both from ſome more antient and common ſource*: yet in regard to Syria it muſt with reaſon be thought more probable, that the prevalence of this mode there was rather derived from the Perſians, to whom it was ſo long in ſubjection, than voluntarily borrowed from the neighbouring Egyptians; a foreign calendar being in thoſe antient times one frequent conſequence of foreign conqueſt. As the prevalence of this mode in Syria during Roman times on the weſt ſide of the Perſian Empire, may be thus juſtly conſidered as a relic of the more extenſive prevalence of the ſame practice throughout the Perſian Empire in more antient times; ſo alſo another more perfect relic of the ſame has been ſince diſcovered ſubſiſting on the eaſt ſide of that Empire in a ſtill later age: for when the Mahometan Arabs deſtroyed the ſecond Perſian Empire in the 651ſt year of Chriſt, they found the Perſian æra of Iſdegird, eſtabliſhed there in vulgar uſe,

* M. Bailly has lately publiſhed a tract in France, to prove that ſome more antient empire than either that of Chaldæa or Egypt had formerly ſubſiſted in Aſia; from which ſource he deduces the many ſimilar opinions and practices of different Aſiatic nations.

to be reckoned by retrograde years of 365 days only, without any intercalary day, ſimilar to thoſe employed in our Chaldæan æra; and by the writings of Perſian and Arabic authors imported into Europe within a century paſt, as alſo by ſome ſtill older accounts of learned Greeks derived from the ſame ſources*, it appears that this kind of year had ſubſiſted in Perſia from the higheſt antiquity; and if in Perſia, moſt probably formerly throughout the Perſian Empire, and in Chaldæa likewiſe: but of this more hereafter. So that by every view, which we take of this ſubject, we find reaſon to conclude more and more, that the æra of Nabonaſſar is ſtill in its original ſtate; that it was not merely an account of antient times reckoned backward up to the acceſſion of Nabonaſſar from the Egyptian æra of Phillip in conformity to the Egyptian year, and made by Greek aſtronomers ſettled at the academy there; but on the contrary, that it had been received by the Egyptians in its preſent form from the Perſians themſelves: and when the Perſian Empire became ex-

* Iſaacus Argyrus, a monk, and Georgius Chryſococces, a phyſician, who both lived in the 14th century, ſome of whoſe writings concerning the Perſian calendar are ſtill preſerved and quoted by Scaliger and Petavius.

tinct

tinct on the death of Alexander, the antient æra by which they had reckoned, was continued by Greeks and Perſians in Egypt under the title of the æra of Phillip in the ſame mode as before.

Thus then it ſeems more eaſy perhaps to trace up to high antiquity in Aſia the ſeveral conſtituent parts of the mode of reckoning in the preſent form of our Chaldæan æra, than to account for any part of that mode being tranſported from Aſia into Europe, and even found eſtabliſhed in Germany and France until a thouſand years after Chriſt: for our Benedictine author ſays, "Our [old Francic] authors, at the next following January after the acceſſion of our Kings, often dated the commencement of a ſecond year of their reigns, although they were not ignorant, that their acceſſion did not take place until many months after the foregoing January. Nor was this practice peculiar to French authors; but may be found alſo in deeds by the Emperors of Germany, Otto 1ſt in 966, Otto 2d his ſon, Conrad 2d, Henry 3d, and Lothario 2d, as may be ſeen in the firſt volume of the Chronicle of Gottwich: this practice was alſo of much higher antiquity." *Diſſert. ſur les Dates, p.* 8. *in Notes.* As the Francic and German Emperors were mimics in mock majeſty

majeſty of the Roman Emperors, to whoſe power and titles they ſucceeded, this method of computation was probably derived to them from the Romans; accordingly we have ſome teſtimonies preſerved, that it had been ſometimes adopted even in Italy: both Petavius and Pagi have not only found it neceſſary often to reckon in this method the years of ſeveral Roman Emperors as ſtated by Roman hiſtorians, but they alſo give us direct proofs, that Roman reigns were ſometimes thus reckoned by authors, particularly by Euſebius, Hieronymus, Caſſiodorus, and others; on whoſe dates Petavius obſerves, Minime reprehendendi ſunt veteres illi, qui imperatorum annos non ab eo die putare ſolent, quo primum inierunt, ſed a civili et populari anni primordio, quod *illorum initium anteceſſit* lib. 11. 14. Vignoli by the ſame means has endeavoured to reconcile the different accounts of different antients concerning the duration of ſeveral imperial reigns, by ſhewing that incomplete years had thus been often conſidered as complete ones*. Before theſe Hippolitus (who formed

* "Herodian reckons the years of an Emperor's reign as if they coincided with civil Julian years, that is, as begining at the firſt of January—other hiſtorians alſo have ſometimes aſſigned 3 years to an Emperor, of which by the ſame method of reckoning the firſt

the firſt paſchal canon for the uſe of the Roman Chriſtians in order to find Eaſter, and who before this were obliged to ſend to Alexandria to know when Eaſter would fall) appears to have begun the reckoning in his canon from the firſt year of the Emperor Alexander after the ſame Chaldæan method: for in the canon he places the Eaſter of his firſt year 222 in the firſt year of Alexander; yet Vignoli has produced ſtrong reaſons to prove, that the preceding Emperor Elagabalus, did not die until the July following in this year 222: Hippolitus therefore reckoned the firſt year of Alexander from the new year's day of the Julian year *before* his acceſſion†. As Elagabalus and Alexander were natives of Syria, it is poſſible that this Aſiatic method might be firſt introduced about their time into Italy; and as Hyppolitus wrote in Greek, although for the uſe of the Romans, he might poſſibly be of Aſiatic origin alſo: but whenever this method was introduced into Italy, in caſe it was not original there, yet theſe particulars contain ſufficient evidence, that it had in ſome caſes at leaſt ſubſiſted there, before it was tranſported into France and Ger-

firſt and laſt contained only a few months." *J. Vignolii Diſſ.* 2. *Apologetica, &c. Rome* 1714. p. 123.

† See the canon in Scaliger's *Em. Temp.* p. 721.

many:

many: thus we find, that this circumſtance of the Chaldæn method had prevailed more or leſs in moſt nations during antient times, and was no peculiarity in that æra, as Jackſon pretends, when he attributes it "to a peculiar fancy of Ptolomey himſelf." That other circumſtance alſo, the omiſſion of Kings of ſhort reigns, has been found ſubſiſting as far as China, as Dodwell long ago obſerved; Solenne id fuiſſe Sinenſibus teſtis eſt in Sinica Hiſtoria Martinius. *(Diſſ. Cypr. ſ. 26)*. So that the Chaldæan æra bears all the marks not only of high but alſo of oriental antiquity; and thoſe very circumſtances, which at firſt might raiſe prejudices againſt its having ever been an æra in vulgar uſe, on farther conſideration are thus found to confirm it; and to diſprove the ſuppoſition of its having been merely an aſtronomical æra compiled by Greek aſtronomers in Egypt, like Scaliger's Julian Period, for the ſole uſe of recording their own aſtronomic obſervations; although indeed at laſt it became applied to this purpoſe, when it had ceaſed to be any longer in vulgar uſe either in Chaldæa, Perſia or Egypt: but this very laſt uſe of it ſerves to confirm in ſome degree its antiquity; for how came it to be ſo much uſed by aſtronomers afterwards, except becauſe the oldeſt obſervations of

eclipſes

eclipſes at Babylon had been recorded by the dates of this æra? ſo that it had become a kind of univerſal æra in uſe among aſtronomers of different nations; juſt as the Perſian and Arabian aſtronomers at this very day ſtill regiſter their aſtronomic obſervations by the antient Perſian æra of Iſdegird, although it is now no longer in vulgar uſe any where, and although they themſelves make uſe of a different æra and different calendar for all their own civil affairs. The words of Cenſorinus ſeem ſtill farther to confirm the antient vulgar uſe of the Chaldæan æra, when he ſays, Ut a noſtris, ita ab Ægyptiis quidam anni in literas relati ſunt, ut quos Nabonazarou nominant: for the phraſe *in literas relati ſunt* ſtrictly implies, "that ſomething is conſigned to writing and preſerved there," which had exiſted before, although chiefly in the memories and converſation of men.

By an application of the right method of Chaldæan computation to the caſes of Cyrus and Cambyſes, it is proved, that moſt modern chronologers have embraced a falſe principle by including the 7 months of Smerdis in the 8th and laſt year of Cambyſes, inſtead of the 1ſt year of his ſucceſſor Darius; whereby they have reckoned up thoſe 7 months twice, and alſo again reckoned twice the laſt 6 months of Cyrus.

OUR inveſtigation of the method adopted in the Chaldæan æra and that of Phillip for the diſtribution of the odd months of a ſhort reign between a predeceſſor and ſucceſſor, together with theſe proofs of the reality of theſe æras having been both in vulgar uſe, will now enable us to detect an error in our modern ſyſtems concerning Cyrus and Cambyſes; and afterwards will enable us, in ſeveral other reigns, to recover very nearly a knowledge of the ſeaſon of year, at which many Perſian Kings acceded, and which the Greek hiſtorians, now extant, have in their ſhort abſtracts omitted to mention; whereby modern chronologers have, by conjecture, fixed them ſometimes different from the truth.

Our

Our moſt modern ſyſtems include the 7 months of the omitted King Smerdis, in the 8th and laſt year of the predeceſſor Cambyſes; when they reckon by the Julian year, which at this period of time coincided exactly with the Chaldæan year, and therefore they muſt neceſſarily reckon them the ſame alſo in the Chaldæan æra: but hereby theſe odd months are reckoned up twice, in caſe they were really included by the reckoning of that æra within the 1ſt year of the ſucceſſor Darius, as we ſhall find reaſon to conclude they were, both from antient chronologers and from the ſeaſon of year at which Cyrus died. 1. The Parian marbles, as I have ſhewn at p. 250, place the acceſſion of Darius at moſt no higher than at the begining of the 2d year of his reign in the Chaldæan æra; whence we may form ſome preſumption, that his firſt *nominal* Chaldæan year was chiefly compoſed out of the 7 real months of his predeceſſor Smerdis: for the Greeks would as naturally place Darius's 1ſt year at the commencement of the following archonſhip *ſoon after* his acceſſion, as the Chaldæan æra through its different method of computation would place it at the new year *long before* his acceſſion. 2. Euſebius confirms this; for under the 1ſt of Darius he places

Duo

Duo fratres magi, menſes ſeptem; and afterwards, as mentioned at p. 257, he expreſsly ſays, that he reckons up the 2d year of Darius twice, adding this reaſon for it, "because one year [*i. e.* the 1ſt year commonly attributed to him] was in reality chiefly occupied by the 7 months of the Magi." Why then have the moderns now totally rejected theſe authorities both prophane and Chriſtian? I have been able to diſcover no other reaſon for their conduct than an ambiguous paſſage in Herodotus, which proves nothing in favour of one half of our chronologers, even if ever ſo clear; and is of too dubious a ſenſe to ſupport the practice of the other half againſt ſo many proofs to the contrary, as may be produced. Now Herodotus ſays, "that Cambyſes reigned 7 years and 5 months," and adds ſoon after, according to the common tranſlation, "that Smerdis reigned the remaining 7 months, which go toward compleating the 8th year of Cambyſes*:" if we ſhould allow this to be the preciſe import of the Greek phraſe, yet it can never be uſed as a proof, whether the reign of Smerdis was or was not included under that of Cambyſes in the Chaldæan æra, by thoſe authors who main-

* Lib. 3. See alſo p. 260.

tain

tain with Vignoles that our preſent Chaldæan æra was compiled at earlieſt by Beroſus after the death of Alexander, and 100 or 160 years after the laſt days of Herodotus. Still leſs can this paſſage prove any thing in favour of thoſe, who with Petavius make the Chaldæan æra no older than Hipparchus above 100 years later than Beroſus*: nevertheleſs Petavius is ſo inconſiſtent as to have recourſe to this very proof; Regnavit Cambyſes annis, ut Herodoto placet, 7 cum menſibus 5: magi vero menſibus 7; qui octavum Cambyſis annum expleverunt: ideo Cambyſi *Quidam* octo annos aſſignant (*Doct. Temp.* 10. 16.); and Petavius himſelf is among theſe *quidam* (as appears from the ſubjoined paſſages and his table in the 13th book) without his aſſigning any other reaſon, than the preceding one from Herodotus†. Jackſon and Prideaux are ſtill leſs conſiſtent concerning this article: when Jackſon is expreſsly treating of the Chaldæan

* Syderum deſcriptiones Nabonaſſareis annis circumſcribere ſolet Ptolomæo antiquior Hipparchus. *Doctr.* Temp. 7. 13. See alſo p. 205, note 1ſt.

† Conſtat Cambyſem annis regnaſſe non integros 8, ſed 7 cum menſibus 5, item magos ſucceſſiſſe menſibus 7: unde ab initio Cyri ad Darium anni ſunt *ſolidi* 38. *Doctr. Temp. lib.* 10. *c.* 14. Regnavit Cambyſes annis 7, menſibus 5, quod reliquum erat hujus anni Smerdis explevit. *Ration. Temp. lib.* 3. *c.* 10.

æra

æra and contending, that it was not only compoſed by Ptolomey, but alſo "that by a peculiar fancy of his own he made the years of every reign complete and left out thoſe reigns which were leſs than a year, by which he miſreckoned now and then a year," yet does Jackſon ſend us back to the words of Herodotus 550 years before Ptolomey, to prove, that the 7 months of Smerdis are included in the 8th year of Cambyſes in the Chaldæan æra firſt negligently compiled, as he maintains, by Ptolomey himſelf*. Prideaux is equally inconſiſtent, but leſs ſteady in his inconſiſtency: in one place he ſays "the Chaldæan year at that time [viz. of Daniel] was moſt certainly the Nabonaſſarean year conſiſting of 365 days, and the Egyptian year was the ſame, and ſo was the Perſian *(at year* 458. *ſect.* 5.);" in proof of this he refers us to Petavius as well as Scaliger, although the former (as I have ſhewn) contradicted Scaliger in this point, and even diſagreed with himſelf. Hence however one would be apt to conclude, that Prideaux thought the æra of Nabonaſſar might be much older than Herodotus: but in another place he

* "Cambyſes reigned no more than 7 years and 5 months, and Smerdis 7 months, which were added to the reign of Cambyſes, and made it 8 years. Herodot. lib. 3, c. 66, 67." (Note 23 to p. 444. Vol. 1.)

ſays,

ſays, "Ptolomey being a native of Alexandria begins the reign of Alexander over the Eaſt from the building of this City." (B. 7. paragr. ult.*) What is this but to affirm, that Ptolomey himſelf was the compiler of the æra of Nabonaſſar, of which the reign of Alexander forms the laſt portion? for if the year at which Alexander began his reign in that æra depended on the mere will and pleaſure of Ptolomey, although 8 years before the end of it, this laſt portion at leaſt could not be older than Ptolomey; and if not this laſt, why any preceding portion? But the true cauſe why in that æra Alexander begins with the year there marked 417, I have already diſplayed at p. 231, not on account of the foundation of Alexandria which indeed was probably laid by him in the begining of that ſame year; but becauſe the victory at Arbela took place at the latter end of it: accordingly Plutarch teſtifies, that on the ſame account the Greeks themſelves as well as the Chaldæan æra conſidered Alexander to be King of Perſia from that moment; for he ſays, "that immediately after the victory Alexander was ſaluted King of Aſia†."

* This error is copied from Uſher.

† Hoc Pugnæ illius eventu imperium Perſarum omnino ſubverti videbatur, Rex vero Aſiæ Alexander ſalutatus Diis magnifice ſacrificabat. *Alexand.*

After

After theſe inconſiſtencies, we need not wonder, that Prideaux alſo ſhould refer to Herodotus for proof of the 7 months of Smerdis being included in the ſame Julian year, and conſequently in the ſame Chaldæan year with the 8th of Cambyſes; a fact which requires a very different kind of evidence, and may be diſproved by aſcertaining the ſeaſon of year at which Cyrus and Cambyſes died, whether long before or about the Chaldæan new year's day in thoſe Julian years. Uſher, Univ. Hiſt. Blair and others have alſo implicitely followed Petavius in the ſame error.

It is then only Scaliger, Newton and ſuch others, as allow the Chaldæan æra to have ſubſiſted long before Herodotus, who can draw any proof from his words concerning any dates contained there: but none of theſe authors have ever appealed to Herodotus for proof of this point*; and if they had, yet when the import of his words ſhall be preciſely expreſſed in tranſlation, they will be found to contain either no proof what-

* On the contrary Scaliger expreſsly places Smerdis in the 9th year of Cambyſes, "nonus annus Cambyſis et 7 menſes, per quos a magis regnatum eſt, in unum Tempus conjiciuntur." *Animadverſ. in Euſeb. Chron. Græc. Olym.* 63. Here is an error however in ſuppoſing a 9th year of Cambyſes; he ſhould have ſaid the firſt of Darius.

ever

ever of the point in queſtion, or at moſt a very dubious and precarious one. For Chronologers have given the ſame force to theſe words as in the foregoing tranſlations, an example, which the tranſlators of Herodotus had indeed ſet them*; that is, they have conſtructed Καμβυσῃ after ὀκτω ἐτεα, as if Herodotus had ſaid, "That the ſeven months of Smerdis were included in the eighth year *of* Cambyſes;" whereas Καμβυσῃ is governed of ἐπιλοιπους, and the whole really expreſſes only, than "That Smerdis reigned 7 months, the number wanting *to* the reign of Cambyſes in order to the completion of eight years:" theſe words then ſay no more than, "That the 7 months of Smerdis *if added* to the reign of Cambyſes *would* complete it to eight full years," and they do not aſſert "That eight years were *actually* by the Perſian reckoning aſcribed to Cambyſes, and that the 7 months of Smerdis were included by them or by any others in his eighth and laſt:" on the contrary he had juſt before ſaid, that only 7 years and 5 months were attributed to the reign of Cambyſes. But even ſuppoſing that the common ſenſe could be ſqueezed out of the words, yet before any

* Ὁ δε Μαγος, τελευτησαντος Καμβυσεω αδεως εβασιλευσεν, επιβατευων του ονοματος Σμερδεος τε Κυρου, μηνας επτα της ἐπιλοιπους Καμβυσῃ ες τα ὀκτω ἐτεα της πληρωσιος.

conſequence can be drawn from them concerning the diſtribution of theſe 7 months in the Chaldæan æra, it muſt be firſt moreover ſuppoſed, that the Chaldæan æra was received by the Perſians in vulgar uſe, that Herodotus had ſeen it, that he intended in this paſſage to explain the method of reckoning theſe reigns there, that he was ſo attentive as not to be capable of miſtake, and ſtill farther that he had in view no reference to the completion of 8 Attic or Olympic years rather than of 8 Perſian ones; the ends of which two firſt in the age of Herodotus were 6 months later than the Perſian: the laſt ſuppoſitions ſeem to be very precarious; the two firſt are probable from the exact correſpondence between the ſums of reign in Herodotus and the Chaldæan æra. For Euſebius informs us, that Cyrus was eſteemed to have reigned 20 years before the capture of Babylon; to which tradition Herodotus adding the 9 years of the Chaldæan æra probably hence formed his 29, and found the two ſums of 8 and 36 to include ſomehow the 3 following Kings: but as this diſtribution of theſe ſums between theſe 4 Kings is different in ſome reſpects from that of all antient Hiſtorians and Chronologers ſince, except the Chaldæan æra, it is extraordinary, that Herodotus ſhould have happened

pened by mere accident only to agree with that, and diſagree with all others; it rather affords a preſumption, that he had copied his ſums from it and with accuracy, (ſee p. 234 in note); his words then rather form a *third* proof, that Chronologers have reckoned up theſe 7 months twice; for ſince Herodotus the oldeſt authority extant agrees with the Chaldæan æra in the ſums of 3 other Perſian reigns, where his meaning is clear; it muſt be prepoſterous to ſuppoſe that he diſagrees with it in the ſingle inſtance of Smerdis, in which his words ſeem not quite free from ambiguity, but may admit of a conſonant ſenſe as well as one not conſonant to the reckoning in that æra.

But inſtead of relying upon the ſenſe of words ſo ambiguous, and upon concluſions ſo precarious in regard to a principle, which affects the whole line of Kings in Media as well as the Jewiſh Scriptures, let us ſearch for ſome ſtill ſurer evidence, and ſuch a *fourth* proof the ſeaſon of year at which Cyrus died will afford us. Herodotus relates, that he was ſlain in a military expedition againſt ſome of the Scythian nations on the north of Perſia*. The extracts from Cteſias in Photius agree to the ſame with

* Lib. i. ſect. ult.

ſome immaterial variations; yet they particularly add, that Cyrus did not long ſurvive his wound; but died on the third day after*. Now we are certain, that Cteſias would have contradicted Herodotus with reſpect to this circumſtance of Cyrus's death, if he could have found among the Perſians any grounds for it: for Photius obſerves, "That he accuſed Herodotus of relating fables and differed from him in almoſt all events†." All the antients agree in the ſame fact, except Xenophon in his Romance; where political juſtice and civil inſtruction required, that he ſhould make his Socratic hero die both in old age and at home happy in peace: in other reſpects alſo the concluſion of that romance is ſo inconſiſtent with hiſtory, as manifeſtly betrays its nature. We are aſſured by Cicero, that Cyrus was 40 years old when he aſcended the throne; we know that he reigned 20 years before his conqueſt of Babylon, and died 9 years afterwards, aged about 70‡: now Xenophon makes him not to

* Ετελευτησε τριτη ὑσλερον απο τε τραυμαλος ἡμερα, βασιλευσας ετη λ.

† Σχεδον εν ἁπασι αντικειμενα Ηροδοτῳ ἱστορων, αλλα καὶ ψευστην αυτον αποκαλων εν πολλοις καὶ λογοποιων.

‡ Quæ Magi Cyro interpretati ſunt ex Dionyſii Perſici libris proferam: nam ei dormienti ex triplici appetitione Solis 30 annos Cyrum regnaturum eſſe, portendi; quod ita contigit; nam ad ſeptuageſimum pervenit,

marry until after his conqueſt of Babylon, and nevertheleſs on his death bed to addreſs his two ſons as grown men with much deep political advice for their government of the kingdom, without a ſyllable of advice about any guardians during their infancy; ſuch a Socratic harangue to children of 7 and 8 years old at moſt muſt be very edifying; but we know that Cambyſes was arrived at manhood before his acceſſion. Accordingly Cicero has thus conveyed to us the ſentiments of the antients concerning this ſubject, Cyrus ille a Xenophonte non ad hiſtoriæ fidem ſcriptus; ſed ad effigiem juſti imperii*. However Hutchinſon and others may attempt to explain away the plain ſenſe of theſe words, they are juſtly commented upon and their meaning fixed by Auſonius, Vellem, ſi rerum natura pateretur, Xenophon Attice! in ævum noſtrum venires, tu, qui ad Cyri virtutes exequendas *votum* potius quam *hiſtoriam* commodaſti; quum diceres, non qualis *eſſet*, ſed qualis eſſe *deberet*: ſi nunc in tempora iſta procederes, in noſtro Gratiano cerneres, quod in Cyro tuo *non videras*, ſed *obtabas*. (*Actio Gratiarum Gratiano Imp. pro Conſulatu*).

pervenit, cum 40 natus annos regnare cœpiſſet. *De Divin.* 1, 46.

* *Epiſt. Quint. Fr.* 1. 1.

It

It is wonderful then to find Uſher, Prideaux, and ſo many others attempting to intermix in one relation the real accounts of hiſtory with the fictitious ones of Xenophon; thoſe who adhere to Xenophon muſt allow to Cyrus more than 9 years after the Capture of Babylon before his death*: but this is clearly contradicted by the Chaldæan æra; and Xenophon himſelf alſo in his account of the retreat of the Greeks contradicts his own relation in his Cyropædia in another capital article. For he there expreſsly teſtifies, that Cyrus ſeized upon the throne of Media by force of arms, not as in his romance ſucceeded to it by the donation of his pretended couſin Cyaxares 2d and father-in-law as a marriage portion: ſpeaking of Lariſſa, a city near the Euphrates, he ſays, "That Cyrus beſieged it when he ſeized on the kingdom of Media†;" and ſoon after he mentions ano-

* Yet Prideaux aſſerts, "that Xenophon ſaith, Cyrus reigned 7 years after the death of Cyaxares and 9 from the taking of Babylon." (at year 538 in note). This aſſertion attributed to Xenophon aroſe from a miſtaken interpretation of the words, Κυρος αφικνειται εις περσας το εβδομον επι της αρχης ἀυτου; in which Prideaux underſtands το εβδομον to mean *the ſeventh year* inſtead of *the ſeventh time during his reign*, as even Hutchinſon juſtly contends in his Preface; and it is not ἀπο but επι. *Cyropæd.* 8, 45.

† Ταυτην [Λαρισσαν] βασιλευς ὁ περσων, ὁτε παρα Μηδων ελαμβανεν την αρχην περσαι, πολιορκων εδενι τροπῳ εδυνατο ἑλειν· ἡλιος

ther city Meſpila, "which, he ſays, Cyrus beſieged likewiſe, and the Queen of Media had retired into it for protection;" both of which after much difficulty he took. This proof M. Freret* had ſuggeſted before: a long liſt may be added alſo of the moſt credible antient authors, who all uniformly agree in the ſame fact; Herodotus, Cteſias†, Valer. Maxim‡. Dionyſius§, Plato||, Ariſtotle**, Dinon††, Diodorus‡‡,

ἡλιος δε νεφελην προκαλυψας ηφανισε μεχρις οι ανθρωποι εξελιπον, καὶ ἑλω ἑαλω. *Lib.* 3.

* Memoires de l'Acad. Vol. 4.

† Φυγειν απο προσωπε Κυρε Ασλυιγαν—ληφθεισα δε πεδαις παχειαις δεδηναι. *Photii excerpt. a Cteſia.*

‡ Cyri ortus ad imperium Aſiæ Aſtyages fruſtra diſcutere tentavit. *c.* 7. Thamyris caput Cyri abſciſſum in utrem dimitti juſſit. *c.* 10.

§ Perſæ devictis Medis Aſia pene tota potiti ſunt, *lib.* 1.

|| Κυρος ελευθερωσας περσας—τους δεσποτας Μηδους εδελωσαλο. *Menexeno.* Κυρος ὡς παντες ισασι και αι ἱστοριαι μαρτυρουσι, παραλαβων τους Περσας τοις Μηδοις λατρευοντας τουτους ανλι δελων δεσποτας καλεσιησε. *Republ. lib.* 9.

** Facile inſurgunt duces exercituum adverſus Principes ſuos, quemadmodum Cyrus contra Aſtyagem, cujus contemnebat potentiam, quia copiæ ejus jam conſenuiſſent, et ipſe in deliciis vitam agebat. *Politic.* 5. 10.

†† Ut aſſerit Dinon in rebus Perſicis, cognoverant Cantores primi Cyri ſtrenuitatem, atque bellum id, quod futurum erat contra Aſtyagem. *Athenæus, lib.* 14, 13.

‡‡ Aſtyagem Cyrus Perſæque devicerunt. *Lib.* 3, 9.

Strabo*,

Strabo*, Theophilus†, Euſebius‡, Juſtin§, Paſchal Chron‖. and Syncellus††. Plato particularly adds, that it was a fact, which "all men know, and Hiſtories teſtify." Can it be reaſonable to oppoſe to all theſe the ſingle authority of a Romance, contradicted even by its own author when writing true hiſtory? A third capital article is equally contradicted by the unanimous conſent of the antients, even of Cteſias as well as Herodotus, viz. that Aſtyages ever had any ſon called Cyaxares, or any ſucceſſor before Cyrus, or any male iſſue whatever. (vid. Jackſon Vol. I. 411.) There are alſo two other articles in Xenophon's account equally contradicted by hiſtory; for he makes the laſt king of Babylon to be ſlain by Cyrus; whereas Megaſthenes and Beroſus agree, that Cyrus made him governor

* Perſæ et Cyrus, ſuperatis Medis, Suſiam Imperii ſedem locaverunt—Cyrus Paſargadas habuit in honore, quod ibi Aſtyagem Medum ultimo prælio ſuperavit, et Aſiæ Imperium in ſe tranſtulit. *lib.* 15.

† Κυρος αναιρεθεντος υπο Τομυριδος εν Μασσαγετια. *lib.* 3.

‡ Cyrus Medorum deſtruxit imperium, et regnavit Perſis ſubverſo Aſtyage Medorum rege. *Olym.* 55.

§ Prælio Aſtyages capitur, cui Cyrus nihil aliud quam regnum abſtulit. *lib.* 1, 7.

‖ Κυρος τον Ασιυαγην καθελων την Μηδων καθειλεν βασιλειαν. *Ad Olymp.* 51. Τομυρις Μασσαγετων βασιλισσα Κυρον ανειλεν. *Ibid.*

†† Cyrus Maſſagetico bello periit *Joſephus* 11. 2. So alſo Sulpitius and Oroſius.

of

of a Province. (Vide p. 24.) Again he makes the Capture of Babylon to have followed immediately after the Capture of Sardis, whereas it appears from hiſtory, that there were 10 years diſtance between them; the laſt is the only circumſtance in which any of the antients ſeem to have followed Xenophon; of which ſome traces appear in Juſtin. It is in vain then for Uſher, Prideaux and others to interweave the invented relation of Xenophon, with the accounts in the Jewiſh ſcriptures; the veracity of the ſcriptures muſt ſtand or fall with that of ſo many unexceptionable prophane writers, confirmed by the teſtimony of all antient Chriſtian chronologers, as well as moſt modern ones; for Scaliger, Calviſius, Helvicus, Petavius, Vignoles and Jackſon all reject this fable about Cyaxares. Joſephus is the only antient author, who has adopted it, and this apparently for no other reaſon than to account for the Darius Mede mentioned in Daniel: after this tale had been ſo long buried in oblivion, it was again revived by ſome modern commentator to ſerve the ſame purpoſe as in Joſephus; but modern chronologers nevertheleſs ſtill placed it among the viſions of commentators, until that Uſher (as I believe) firſt introduced it into Hiſtory, ſince which it has kept its place in Prideaux

Univ. Hiſt. Loyd, Blair and others. But if it were not a ſufficient objection to this tale of Xenophon, that it is inconſiſtent with antient Hiſtory; yet it muſt be a ſufficient objection to our modern hiſtorians, that they have been ſo inconſiſtent as neither to adhere altogether to Xenophon, nor yet to other antient Hiſtory; but have formed an incongruous relation out of the two accounts, which is indeed ſilently themſelves to reject their own author: for Xenophon certainly ſpecifies no particular number of years that Cyrus lived after his marriage; therefore Cyrus's dying ſpeech has no inconſiſtency in his own work; but Uſher and Prideaux, by fixing Cyrus's death within 9 years at moſt after the Capture of Babylon and his marriage, have made him talk to children as if they were grown men. Indeed there are ſuch proofs of his not having lived longer, that it is a point which cannot admit of alteration; but then this very circumſtance proves the fabulous nature of Xenophon's relation, and the injudiciouſneſs of thoſe who thus incongruouſly uniting truth with falſehood, bring doubt and diſcredit upon the Jewiſh ſcriptures.

If then Cyrus died during his expedition againſt the Scythians, it muſt have been during the ſummer; for it was then only that military

litary expeditions were attempted even in the milder climate of Aſia as well as now in Europe, more eſpecially amidſt the Scythian ſnows on the north of Perſia. In the mild climate indeed of Aſia minor Cyrus ſeems to have made part of a winter's campaign againſt Cræſus; but it is evidently related as an extraordinary action even in that country; for it is mentioned, that "Cræſus retired to his own kingdom, in order to place his army in winter quarters, intending in the ſpring to take the field again againſt Cyrus" (Her. 3.): but Cyrus purſued him and beſieged his capital in the beginning of winter. So Europeans coming from a northern climate might during the Cruſades have ſometimes better ſupported the inconveniences of a winter expedition in Paleſtine, than the heats of ſummer; but with the natives it appears to have been otherwiſe in general; for the ſcripture ſpeaks of the ſpring as being the ſeaſon "When Kings go out to war" (2 Sam. xi 1.); and indeed even there the ſnows are ſometimes deep in winter, the rains heavy and the torrents ſudden. Alexander's army again might ſupport a ſhort expedition at the end of winter among the mountains in the midſt of Perſia, which Curtius mentions as being covered with froſt and ſnow ſo late as after the riſing of the *Vergiliæ*, which is about the 7th of May, and was by the antients

conſidered as the end of winter*. Nevertheleſs a campaign into the diſtant parts of Scythia could have never been attempted except in the midſt of ſummer, as our knowledge of that country from modern travellers prove, and Curtius's own account ſufficiently confirms†. If then Cyrus was ſlain during ſome of the ſummer months, it muſt have been ſomewhere about the middle of a Chaldæan year; for at his death it began on the 3d of January: hence it appears, that although only 9 years are

* Uſher and Prideaux underſtand Curtius to mean by *ſub ipſum vergiliarum ſidus*, the middle of winter after the *ſetting* of the vergiliæ, which was at the end of October; but I much doubt whether this phraſe can be found any where uſed in ſuch a ſenſe, as to mean *after* the *ſetting* of a conſtellation; it apparently means *under* the influence of a conſtellation, therefore *after* its *riſing* and ſo long as it is viſible in the heavens, not after it has become inviſible. Thus Virgil ſays, *ſub ipſum arcturum*, i. e. after the riſing of Arcturus (G. 1. 67.) In the ſame ſenſe Palladius uſes *ſub occaſu vergiliarum*, i. e. *at* the ſetting of the virgiliæ, not *after* they are ſet; juſt as Virgil ſays, *Extremæ ſub caſum Hyemis*, at the very end of winter. But for *ſub ſydus* to mean the abſence of a conſtellation is like *lucus a non lucendo*.

† When deſcribing the tract over which Cyrus's army had paſſed, he ſays, Adeo hyeme altæ nives premunt terram, gelu et perpetua pene rigore conſtrictæ, ut ne avium quidem feræve ullius veſtigium exſtet. *lib.* 7.

marked

marked in the Chaldæan æra for the reign of Cyrus, yet he muſt have really entered ſeveral months into his 10th year before he was ſlain, ſince only complete years are marked there; and theſe overplus months whether 6 or 7 would be in courſe included in the firſt year of his ſucceſſor Cambyſes; who muſt conſequently have died either not long before or ſoon after the end of a Chaldæan year commencing on January 1ſt; and therefore the following 7 months of Smerdis muſt have neceſſarily been included in the firſt of the ſucceſſor Darius, the 227th Chaldæan year. This was probably the reaſon why Herodotus gives Cyrus only 29 years, by his following cloſely the Chaldæan æra and thereby excluding the overplus months; while Cteſias, and Cicero from Dionyſius Perſicus made them amount to 30, becauſe he wanted only a few months of that number: ſo that even this very diſagreement among the antients affords a *fifth* proof, ſince his laſt 7 m. help to form the 1ſt year of Cambyſes; as Petavius in fact acknowledges in one place*, yet inconſiſtently in another place, and in his table allows 38 complete years from the acceſſion of Cyrus to the 1ſt of

* 30m annum aut implevit Cyrus, aut, quod propter Heredoti authoritatem *veriſimilius* eſt, inchoavit. 10. 14.

Darius

Darius (vide nõte p. 285); which is therefore 1 full year too much, ariſing from theſe two inaccuracies of the overplus 7 months of Cyrus and the 7 months of Smerdis being both reckoned up twice: hereby the acceſſion of Cyrus is raiſed 1 year too high.

This concluſion may be ſtrengthened by a *ſixth* proof, which will aſcertain ſtill more preciſely at what time of year Smerdis was ſlain, whereby it will appear to have been on the 15th of July; conſequently the greater portion of his ſeven full months (for Herodotus ſays, that he was ſlain in his 8th) would fall to the ſhare of his *ſucceſſor* Darius, agreeably to the rule pointed out before concerning the reigns of Kings, whoſe names are omitted, and only a very ſmall portion would fall to the ſhare of the *predeceſſor* Cambyſes. Now Herodotus relates, that the Perſians celebrated a religious feſtival in memory of the depoſition and death of the uſurper Smerdis the magian by the ſeven conſpirators. The words of Herodotus teſtify, that this feſtival was ſtill obſerved in his own time, not 100 years after its firſt celebration*; and Cteſias agrees that

* Mago occiſo, conjuratores ſimul, quicunque magorum ipſis occurrebat, mactabant: Perſæ et ipſi facienda ſibi eadem cenſuerunt; eductiſque gladiis, ut quemque repericbant magum, interficiebant; et niſi noctis

it was alſo celebrated in his days above 50 years ſtill later†. On the deſtruction of the 1ſt Perſian empire by Alexander, we have no authority to ſuppoſe, that the Parthian empire, to which the Perſians became ſubject within 50 years after, made any conſiderable innovations in the Perſian religion and inſtitutions, but rather embraced the ſame: at leaſt if any innovations were made, we find from hiſtory, that the Perſians were ſtill zealous for their antient religion, as ſoon as the 2d Perſian empire aroſe in the 223d year of Chriſt; which being deſtroyed again in the 651ſt year by the Mahometan Arabs, and various particulars concerning their civil and religious inſtitutions having been hereby tranſmitted to us by thoſe Perſian and Arabian authors, who lived ſoon after, ſuch as Alfraganus, Albutegnius and others; if we could diſcover from their writings any traces of this antient feſtival of *Magophonia* ſubſiſting in their times, we ſhould

noctis interventu cohibiti fuiſſent, neminem magorum reliquiſſent, Hunc Diem Perſæ *maxime ſolennem publicè obſervant*, et in eo *ingens celebrant Feſtum*, vocantes id *magophonia*, quo die nulli magorum fas eſt prodire in lucem. *lib.* 3.

† Quo Die Sphandadates magus interfectus eſt, feſtum apud Perſas celebratur *magophonia* dictum (αγεται τοις περσαις εορλη Μαγοφονιας, καθ' ην Μαγος ανηρηται). *Excerpt. Cteſiæ apud Photium.*

hereby

hereby be able to aſcertain the day, on which that event took place. Now both Alfraganus and Albutegnius, and many other oriental authors take notice of a great feſtival obſerved by the Perſians during the laſt five days of every year, and during the five following intercalary days (the epagomenæ) together with the firſt day of the new year, making 11 days in all. But Alfraganus and Albutegnius alſo both take notice of another ſtated feſtival in the Perſian calendar upon the 16th of their 7th month *Mihr*; Alfraganus mentions another upon the 1ſt of their 9th month *Adur*; the former he calls *Mihr-gidn*, the latter *Keuſeg**: let us enquire then, whether ſome probable conjectures may not be formed, that the former of theſe feſtivals had reference to the event under conſideration. Religious feſtivals

* Menſes Perſarum ſunt, &c. 7. Mihr-ma, hujus dies 16 Mihr-gian dicitur. 9 Adur-ma cujus primus dies celebratur equitatu Keuſegis. *Alfr. Aſtron. cap.* 2. Scaliger and Petavius agree that Alfraganus flouriſhed after the year of Chriſt 833: Golius ſays at leaſt between 833 and 1000; therefore about 200 years after the end of the Perſian monarchy.—"Mahra-mech, cujus 16 dies eſt al-Mahre-gen." *Albutegn. de ſcientia Stell. cap.* 32. *Norimb.* 1537.—"The feſtival of Mihrgan laſted 6 days; it began about the middle of September, being in honor of their great oſtenſible deity the Sun." *Richardſon's Diſſertation*, p. 157.

when

when once eſtabliſhed uſually become permanent for generations afterwards, even after all remembrance has periſhed of the events, which firſt gave riſe to them. Now Golius in his notes on this chapter obſerves, that *Mihr-gian* means *ſolis-genius, vel anima*; nomen habet abeunte Sole et terra ſinum claudente; ſolennia *Mihr-gian* pari fere feſtivitate celebrata ſunt, quemadmodum Sole reverſo ac aperiente ſinum Terrâ ſolennia *Neuruz*. p. 24. That this month is called after the name of the Sun *Mihr*, ſeems now to be agreed to by all; formerly there might be ſome doubt, as different Europeans had expreſſed the Perſian word by ſuch different combinations of Roman letters: for the Latin tranſlator of Albutegnius writes it *Mahra*, Iſaacus Argyrus in Greek letters correſpondent to *Mecher*; Scaliger *Mehar*, Petavius *Mehara*, and Golius *Mihr*: but M. Anquetil, who lately reſided long among the Parſees ſettled in India, and deſcendants of the antient Perſians, whoſe magian religion they ſtill preſerve, calls this month *Mithra*, which we know was an antient appellation of the Sun. The word *gián* or *gen*, is writ *Gahan* by M. Anquetil, *Gan* by M. Richardſon, and evidently implied the idea of a fixed feſtival, what-

ever its original ſenſe may be*. But the ſubject of this feſtival could not have been that pointed out by Golius relative to the autumnal equinox; altho' by the preſent Perſian Calendar it falls about that time: for as the Perſian year long before and during their æra of Iſdergird was retrograde, every month in this calendar would in its turn fall upon the autumnal equinox: neither by the fixed year 360 years before the æra of Iſdergird, ſo far as we can diſcover its nature, could the autumnal equinox fall in the month *Mihr*; for the firſt fixed month *Phavardin* ſeems to have begun on the 16th of June, therefore the 16th day of their 7th month *Mihr* would fall about the winter ſolſtice, and would invert Golius's conjecture. Anquetil explains the name of this and other Perſian months, as being the name of ſome deity, genius or dæmon of the modern Parſees, who preſided over each; but whether both the religion and ſacred language of the preſent Parſees be not mere modern inventions, containing little or no remains of Perſian

* Le jour Mithra du mois Mithra eſt une fête, qui dure ſix jours: les *Gahan-bars* ſont ſix fêtes de cinque jours chacune, inſtitués en differens temps de l'annee. *Zendaveſta by M. Anquetil, in book Boundebeſch.*—The feſtival at the end of the year is called by Alfrag. *Ferudi-gian* in like manner.

antiquity

antiquity is a point, in which Anquetil is oppoſed by M. Richardſon*. We can however at leaſt reaſonably conclude from Alfraganus and Albutegnius, that this feſtival in the month *Mihr* muſt have been of high antiquity in Perſia, and that both name and feſtival had ſome reference to the Sun, a chief object of the Magian religion, we are aſſured by modern accounts, although we are ignorant of the preciſe particulars. Now if the Perſian retrograde year, before a fixed year was introduced there, began on the ſame Julian day with the Egyptian retrograde year (as I have contended at p. 201), the 16th of the month *Mihr* would at the death of Smerdis fall on the 15th of July; for the 1ſt day of their 1ſt month *Phavardin* would have then begun on the 1ſt of January in that year. If then this

* In his *Diſſertation on the Languages of Eaſtern Nations* prefixed to his Perſian dictionary and printed ſeparately. Oxford, 1777. Anquetil probably attributes too much antiquity to the literature of the modern Parſees; and Mr. R. as probably too modern an origin: it is evident at leaſt by the names of the antient Perſian months and feſtivals as preſerved by Alfraganus and explained by Anquetil according to the accounts of the preſent Parſees, that there are great remains of antiquity ſtill preſerved in their names, religion and inſtitutions, if not in their ſacred language alſo, againſt all which Mr. R. has urged nothing convincing, and chiefly that much nonſenſe cannot be antient.

antient feſtival was the ſame as that of the Magophonia, it appears hence again, that the chief portion of the 7 months of Smerdis would fall in the beginning of a Perſian (or Chaldæan) year, and conſequently be included in the 1ſt nominal year attributed to Darius in the Chaldæan æra.

If it be objected, that it is a mere conjecture of my own concerning any identity in theſe two feſtivals; I only anſwer, that there are ſome ſimilar circumſtances, which give grounds for ſuch a conjecture, and I have no deſire to ſtretch any argument farther than it will eaſily bear. Herodotus calls the Magophonia *ingens Feſtum*; Cteſias confirms it, and one ſhould think, that ſuch a capital feſtival could not have altogether been forgotten in the ſpace of the 750 years between Smerdis and the ſecond Perſian kingdom, in a country wherein no conſiderable change of religion had taken place, nor any conqueſt, which contributed to ſuppreſs their civil or religious rites; and in which we know from hiſtory, that during the ſubſequent 300 years the inhabitants continued as zealous of their antient inſtitutions as at firſt, even to a degree of hot perſecution againſt Chriſtianity and innovation; and who had alſo during this period intermixed

intermixed very little with any foreign nations. We know moreover that the Magi were peculiarly worſhippers of the Sun, and that the name of this feſtival was the ſame as that of the Sun, whether it was named from the month, or the month from it: nay ſtill farther it ſeems to be the very ſame name with that of the uſurper, whoſe death was recorded; for Herodotus and the Aſiatic Greeks probably made Smerdin of Merdin, juſt as they made σμικρος of μικρος, by prefixing an initial σ, as in a variety of other caſes. Accordingly Juſtin writes the name *Mergin*, the Paſchal Chronicon Μερδιος; and before Herodotus, Æſchylus alſo had called him Μαρδος in his Perſæ. If the name *Mer-gin* in Juſtin be right, it is the very name of the feſtival in queſtion as nearly as we could expect Greeks to expreſs it; or if it was rather *Mer-din*, it makes little difference, (ſince *din* means *religion**): both would be fit titles in the oriental taſte for a ſon of Cyrus and brother of Cambyſes; for all authors agree, that this was not the original name of the Magian uſurper but of Cyrus's ſon; and only aſſumed by the Magian when

* Only in Arabic (according to the author of *Lettre a M. Anquetil.* Elmſley, Londres, p. 37) But M. Anquetil ſays in the antient Perſian alſo and Zend language.—Sapor K. of Perſia in a letter to a Roman Emperor, ſtyles himſelf *Frater Solis et Lunæ Marcellin.*

he

he perſonated the ſon of Cyrus, who was ſuppoſed to have been ſlain. If then it ſhould even be true, as M. Anquetil and Richardſon ſuggeſt, that the feſtival in the month *Mithra*, together with many others now celebrated by the Parſees, are conſidered as celebrated on a religious account merely, yet this will be no objection why it might not be antiently celebrated on an hiſtoric account alſo relative to the depoſition of this uſurper; it will only follow hence, that the inſtitution of the feſtival might be more antient than this event; and why not? neither the words of Herodotus nor Cteſias clearly determine that this feſtival was firſt *inſtituted* on account of the death of the uſurper; it might have been a feſtival day in courſe, and the plot might be laid by the 7 conſpirators upon that day, as the moſt convenient for its execution; accordingly Herodotus ſeems to intimate this, for he ſays, "that the conſpirators were readily admitted into the palace by the porters, becauſe they came *divina cum pompa*, juſt as Darius had foreſeen*." So that the Magophonia might be afterwards only ſuperadded as a ſecondary motive for a feſtival on that day; and in courſe of time the religi-

* Θειῃ πομπῃ χρεωμενους; and this is farther confirmed by the ſubſequent 5 days of holiday. See p. 313.

ous

ous motive might outlive the hiſtoric one, eſpecially ſince the Magi themſelves were intereſted to have the latter forgot, when they revived their religion in 223. But is it true, that it is even yet forgot, and that no memorial has been preſerved of this feſtival *Mihr-gian* having been antiently celebrated on an hiſtoric account alſo? The real truth is, that there are plain traces of its hiſtoric origin ſtill remaining, and ſuch as are alſo very nearly ſimilar to the circumſtances attending the death of Smerdis. For in the ſame note Golius adds from Arabic authors, "Nuveirius vero aliique tradunt *Mihr* ſignificare antiquis Perſis *Vindictam*; et hoc feſtum ita dictum volunt, quod Feridin Perſarum rex, victo Dahac tyranno, avi ſui Gjemxidis cædem vindicaſſet: Hoc Poeta Ibn Tahir intelligit, ubi inquit "ejuſque viz. *Mihr-gián* ſignificatio, quod illo Die Perſæ vicerunt."

But altho' in the firſt Chaldæan year of Darius (the 521ſt Ant. Chr.) the death of the Magian, and the Perſian feſtival *Mihrgián* muſt, according to the calendar which prevailed then, have fallen on the 15th of July; yet there is reaſon to think, that Darius might not aſcend the throne immediately upon the death of the Magian, nor until ſeveral months afterwards. For as the Parian marbles and Euſebius place his

real

real acceſſion not until about the following winter ſolſtice, ſo Herodotus ſeems at leaſt to countenance the fact, that ſome months might have intervened after the death of the Magian before Darius was raiſed to the throne; for he relates, that the conſpirators diſagreed in their opinions concerning the future government of the kingdom, ſome being for a Monarchy, ſome for an Ariſtocracy and others for a Democracy, but that at laſt it was agreed to place Darius on the throne, who undoubtedly was the right heir to it; what time elapſed during theſe contentions he does not ſpecify; but Æſchylus, a contemporary to that event, teſtifies in a deciſive manner, that Darius could not have ſucceeded immediately; for according to him, in reality two other of the conſpirators had enjoyed the ſupreme power before Darius*. Æſchylus had a diſtinguiſhed ſhare in the victory over Darius at Marathon, and had given this account before Herodotus

* Æſchylus in his tragedy of the Perſæ makes the ghoſt of Darius enumerate the Kings of Aſia before himſelf, begining with Cyaxares as the 1ſt; after whom he mentions Cambyſes as the 4th, the Uſurper as the 5th who was ſlain by Artaphrenes, Maraphis as the 6th, Artaphrenes the 7th, and Darius himſelf as only the ſucceſſor to Artaphrenes.

Πεμπτος δε Μαρδος ηρξεν αισχυνη πατρα
Ἑκτος δε Μαραφις, ἑβδομος τ' Αρταφρενης.

compoſed

compoſed his hiſtory, which however is not inconſiſtent with it: and all the four teſtimonies conſpire in confirming, that the *real* acceſſion of Darius was about the following winter Solſtice; therefore (if Smerdis was ſlain in the ſummer) nearly a whole year after the *nominal* commencement of his 1ſt year in the Chaldæan æra, agreeably to the uſual method obſerved there; which ſpace of time would be chiefly occupied with the 8 incomplete months of Smerdis, together with the following interregnum or ariſtocracy or ſhort reigns of Maraphis and Artaphrenes before Darius aſſumed the crown*. For Euſebius always reckons by

* Writers have been ſo apt to quote antient authorities in a negligent manner, or to make them bend, as they pleaſe, to favour their own ſuppoſitions and eſtabliſhed errors, that they create continual embarraſſments as one proceeds. Here Prideaux, for inſtance, ſays "That the 7 conſpirators on the 6th day came to an agreement, that the monarchy ſhould be continued" (at year 521). But Herodotus his authority for this ſays no ſuch thing, and only "That for 5 days they did nothing (the reaſon of which we have ſeen, thoſe 5 days of Mihr-giân being great religious feſtivals) but on the 6th they entered into conſultations about the future government of the kingdom," the reſult of which was at laſt to raiſe Darius to the throne; yet it no way appears that the determination was made on the 6th day, but only the conſultations begun then, and the determination might have been ſome months after. This circumſtance of

 the

Julian years beginning at the winter Solſtice, and the Parian marbles apparently do the ſame; for they reckon by Archons, who, as Scaliger and Dodwell juſtly contend, entered on their office in that age at the winter Solſtice; at which ſeaſon the Athenians ſeem to have begun their year, before Meto reformed their calendar in the 87th ol. Petavius indeed advances ſome doubts of this, and whether the Athenians did not always begin their *Solar* year at the ſummer Solſtice: Jackſon conſiders theſe doubts as demonſtrations*; yet in truth they amount to little or nothing, being only founded upon ſome ambiguous expreſſions of antient authors, capable of more ſenſes

the 5 days again confirms that the event happened on a feſtival.

* "Dodwell thinks after Scaliger, that the old attic year before Meto began at the winter Solſtice: this he infers from the intercalary month Poſeideon. But Petavius has *proved* againſt Scaliger, that the moſt antient attic year commenced at the ſummer Solſtice." *Jack.* v. 2. p. 44. *Vide* Dodwell de Cyclis. Diſſ. 1. 7. It may be obſerved, that Jackſon in favor of Petavius interprets the words of Avienus, *Primæva Meton exordia ſumſit a Cancro*, as if *primæva* meant *aboriginal*; whereas it as probably meant nothing more than the *firſt year* or *commencement of Meto's Cycle*, which *Cycle* the poetical aſtronomer here terms *ævum*. It is only on ſuch ambiguous proofs a theſe, that Petavius and Jackſon build their opinions.

than

than one. But two facts are irrefragably in favour of Dodwell; firſt, that the Athenians both before and after Meto always inſerted their intercalary month at the end of their month Poſeideon, which fell about the winter Solſtice; and no inſtance can be produced of any nation which did not at firſt intercalate their year at the end of it, however future reformations of their calendar may have made the time of intercalation fall afterwards in the middle, as in February among the Romans after the reformed Julian year took place. Secondly, it is confeſſed by all, even by Petavius and Jackſon, that the *Lunar* year introduced by Solon, and reformed by Cleoſtratus and Harpalus, began at the winter Solſtice. Now it is very improbable, that the Lunar year ſhould begin then, and the Solar year not until the ſummer Solſtice. But even allowing this to be poſſible; yet for what purpoſe was the Lunar year introduced and reformed, except in order to regulate the months of the 12 Archons and other magiſtrates in going into and out of office? It muſt therefore be at the commencement of the Lunar year, that the firſt archonſhip commenced, which diſtinguiſhed each year, until Meto removed both together to the ſummer Solſtice. If then the archonſhip in the Parian marbles cotem-

porary with the 1ſt of Darius began at the winter Solſtice, Darius could not have acceded long before, and we are certain, from the Chaldæan æra, that it could not have been later. Accordingly Corſini accedes to the above opinion of Scaliger and Dodwell*. It follows hence that modern Chronologers by including the ſhort reign of the Magian Smerdis in the Chaldæan year 226, which was the eighth of the predeceſſor Cambyſes, and the 522d before Chriſt, inſtead of the year 227, which was the firſt nominal year of the Succeſſor Darius, have raiſed it into one Chaldæan and conſequently one Julian year too high, and have reckoned up thoſe 7 odd months twice. Scaliger therefore, when he attempted to ridicule Euſebius for ſaying, "*Ideo ſecundus Darii bis ponitur quia unus annus in Magorum 7 menſibus computatur*, diverted himſelf with what he did not comprehend; Ridiculum eſt (ſays he) nam poſt cædem Magorum Darius inivit imperium; quomodo igitur anno *ſecundo* Darii imperare Magi potuerunt? *Animadv. ad Eu-*

* Salaminia pugna, quæ Ol. 75, anno 1 commiſſa fuit, Calliadis archontis anno contigiſſe dicitur, cum tamen Calliadis imperium *Gamelione menſe 4ti Olympiadis 84 inceperit*, atque *in Pario marmore* ad illum annum accuratiſſime referatur. *Diſſertat. Agoniſticæ.* 1. 15. 1752. Et *Faſti Attici.* Diſſ. 9. 29.—*Vide Scal. Emend. Temp. lib.* 2. *De Octaeteride Cleoſtrati.*

ſebium.

ſebium. But Euſebius ſays no ſuch thing, as that the Magi began to reign in the ſecond year of Darius, and only, that their reign was included in *one* of the years aſcribed to Darius, viz. in his firſt, as his preceding words prove; for under that *firſt* year he had ſaid before, *Duo fratres Magi* 7ᵐ: ſo that this paſſage in Euſebius affords a ſtrong preſumption of his having found by ſome prophane authorities now periſhed, that the reign of Smerdis was included in the firſt year uſually aſcribed to Darius.

Farther evidence of the ſame by means of proofs, that the firſt of Cyrus has been raiſed one year too high by the moderns.

WHether the Moderns had any good reaſons to depart from Euſebius concerning the above date of the reign of Smerdis, I ſhall examine afterwards; and the reſult will be, that they have ſometimes as capriciouſly rejected the teſtimony of old Chriſtian Chronologers, when drawn from prophane authors, as at other times they have blindly followed them in certain vulgar errors, into which the antient Chriſtians had been miſled by too implicite a dependence upon the traditional

traditional and current chronology of the Jews, againſt the better evidence both of prophane authors as well as their own ſcriptures. At preſent I ſhall proceed to confirm the contents of the foregoing ſection, by proving that the commencement of Cyrus has been raiſed 1 year too high; and as the neceſſary effect of reckoning up twice the 7 months of Smerdis, and again the laſt odd months of Cyrus twice, is, to raiſe up the firſt of Cyrus 1 year too high; therefore whatever farther evidence ſhall prove, that the 1ſt of Cyrus is actually raiſed 1 year too high, will reciprocally prove, that the above odd months of Cyrus and Smerdis have been reckoned up twice; the one miſreckoning being the natural cauſe of the other.

The *firſt* proof, which preſents itſelf, is from Curtius; who puts into a letter of Narbarſanes for him to tell Alexander, "That the Perſians had ſhewn fidelity to their Kings during 230 years*." This was written by Narbarſanes in the 2d year after the battle

* "Se Dario non fuiſſe inimicum, imo etiam utilia ſuaſiſſe et fidele conſilium dediſſe—per ducentos et triginta annos fidem inviolatam Perſas Regibus ſuis præſtitiſſe." *Lib.* 6. 4. Several of the Perſian Kings had been murdered, yet others of the royal family raiſed to the throne; by *regibus* therefore Narbarſanes could with truth mean only *the royal family*.

of

of Arbela and the 1ſt year after the death of Darius; in which, but not till *after* this letter, the remainder of the royal family ſurrendered themſelves, together with the chief Perſian nobles and the Greek mercenaries; whereby the conqueſt of Perſia was *completed*. Now if Narbarſanes reckoned here incluſively of the year, in which he wrote this letter to Alexander, as the antients generally did reckon†, and as Narbarſanes

† How univerſal among the antients this method of reckoning incluſively of the year, *to* which they reckoned, was, we may judge, by the following inſtances: Cenſorinus ſays, Id tempus τριετηρίδα Græci appellabant, quod tertio quoque anno interkalabatur; quamvis biennii circuitus revera eſſet. *c.* 18. Potter refers to this in his account of the Greek year, but in ſuch a manner, as if it was by a mere blunder, that the Greeks gave the name of *trieteris* to a period in which they intercalated on every *ſecond year*, and which therefore included only *two* complete years; he ought to have added Cenſorinus's reaſon why they gave this appellation of *trieteris* to this period of *two* years, becauſe *tertio quoque anno intercalabatur*, that is, becauſe they reckoned incluſively of the laſt year *to* which they computed, as well as of the firſt *from* which they reckoned: for if the year of intercalation be called the *firſt* year of the period, then the next intercalation would be made upon the *third* year incluſively. So again he ſays, that a period of *four* years they called *pentaeteris*, quod *quinto* quoque anno redibat: therefore the olympic period of 4 years, he adds, was thus called. Again the period of 8 years by Cleoſtratus was, as he ſays, called ενναετηρις, quia *primus*

might probably reckon here, both for the above reaſons and becauſe alſo whatever concern he really had in the murder of Darius, yet he begins his letter with excuſing his conduct by aſſerting, "That he had been no enemy to his King but a friend, who had given him faithful counſel:" in ſuch caſe theſe 230 years, reckoned back from the 419th Chaldæan year incluſively, would begin with the 190th; which was conumerary with the 3d year of the 55th ol. and began about the 5th of January before that olympic year (in 558 before Chriſt); therefore 1 whole year *later* than all modern Chronologers place the acceſſion of Cyrus, which is in the ſpring that concluded the 1ſt olympic year, and at the beginning of the 189th Chaldæan year (conumerary with the

mus ejus annus *nono* quoque anno redibat: The ſame year then, which was reckoned the *ninth* and laſt of a preceding period, was again reckoned as the *firſt* of the ſucceeding period; what is this but to ſay, that they reckoned incluſively both of the year *from* which they reckoned and alſo of that *to* which they computed? In like manner even in modern times we ſtill after the antients call that a quartan ague, which returns after a period of only *three* complete days, becauſe it commences again upon the *fourth* day. The Jews alſo in antient ages, we know, reckoned in the ſame way, by computing the ſame thing, which they called the laſt of a preceding number, to be alſo the firſt of the following number. V. Bowyer's Pref. to Conject. on N. Teſt.

559th

559th before Chriſt). However, as the words of Narbarſanes may admit alſo of a proper application to the death of Darius in the year preceding that in which they were writ, we will therefore advance to another proof, which is not liable to the ſame ambiguity.

Agathias affords us a *ſecond* proof, for he ſays, "That the Perſian kingdom laſted 228 years*:" that he ſhould reckon 2 years leſs than Curtius, makes it again probable, that Curtius reckoned down to the year, in which Narbarſanes wrote his letter 2 years after the battle of Arbela: while Agathias reckoned down no lower than to that battle. Agathias had however ſome good pretence to make the Perſian kingdom laſt until the death of Darius at leaſt, but he could not have the leaſt pretence to ſuppoſe it finiſhed before the victory at Arbela: if then we reckon backwards theſe 228 years from the date of that victory the 417th year incluſively, the earlieſt poſſible date, ſtill

* Agathias auctor eſt lib. 2. Perſarum priſcum a Cyro regnum per annos 228 duraſſe *Petav. Doctr. Temp.* 10. 14.

☞ See the table at the end of this ſection: I prefer to compute by the Chaldæan year rather than by Olympiads, both becauſe at the age in queſtion it nearly coincided with the Julian year, and alſo becauſe it is ſo much eaſier to add and ſubtract dates in it.

they will make Cyrus commence no earlier than the 190th year as before. Now as that victory was obtained on the 1ſt of October, therefore 6 weeks only before the end of the 417th Chaldæan year, and 3 months only before the end of the correſpondent Julian year, there can be no reaſon why that whole year ſhould not be included in the ſum of the Perſian period: Agathias muſt therefore have reckoned here inclu-ſively of the laſt year as well as the firſt, whether he reckoned by the Chaldæan and Perſian or rather by the Julian year, as ſhould ſeem moſt probable; ſince Agathias did not flouriſh until 500 years after Chriſt: if he reckoned by the æra of Greeks or Se-leucidæ, ſtill it would be nearly the ſame, becauſe the years of that æra commenced about the ſpring or the autumnal equinox.

Scaliger had alſo adverted to this paſſage in Agathias, but by committing *two* miſtakes in his reaſoning he drew from it this erro-neous conſequence, that Cyrus muſt have commenced in the 1ſt of 55th ol. and in the Chaldæan year 188*, a year ſooner than

* Annis 228 deductis de anno 4382 periodi Julianæ, in quo victus fuit Darius ultimus, remanent anni 4154, initium ſcilicet Cyri, ann. Nab. 188. Olymp. 55. ann. 1. *Emend. Temp. lib.* 5. *cap. de initio Cyri.*

Petavius

Petavius and others ſince have made him accede.

Petavius has pointed out one of theſe *two* errors of Scaliger; but he takes not the leaſt notice of the other; becauſe it would have militated equally againſt the date of Cyrus's acceſſion in Petavius himſelf as well as in Scaliger: he therefore only obſerves, "That after Scaliger deducts 228 from 4382 there does indeed remain 4154; but then in conſequence the *following* year 4155 of the Julian period muſt be the 1ſt of Cyrus, viz. the Chaldæan year 189, and the 2d of 55th ol. not the 1ſt*:" for the *latter half* of the 1ſt year (primus exiens) was conumerary with the year 189 and the 2d of 55th olympiad. Petavius then, as we ſee, has taken no notice of that *other* error of Scaliger, in ſaying, that Darius was conquered at Arbela in the 4382d year of the Julian period; for this conqueſt was in reality not until the following year 4383, from which deducting 228 there remain 4155; therefore Cyrus did not commence until 4156, the 190th Chaldæan year as we made out at firſt, and as we now find, that Scaliger and Petavius

* Si annis detractis 228 de 4382, ſuperſunt 4154, *ſequens* annus 4155 Cyri primordium habeat neceſſe eſt —ann. Nab. 189.—Olymp. 55. primus *exiens*. 10. 14.

alſo ought of neceſſity to have concluded even from their own principles. For that the victory at Arbela was really in 4383d yea of Scaliger's Julian period is certain; and Scaliger himſelf ſays the ſame afterwards in his chapter concerning that victory; for he there expreſſly places the eclipſe, which preceded the victory a few Days, "Upon the 2d of 112 ol. the 417th of Nabon, and the 4383d of Julian period*." Petavius likewiſe in his Chronologic Tables in *lib.* 13 places this eclipſe together with the ſubſequent victory in 4383 of Julian period, and the 2d of 112th ol. but by his marking againſt thoſe years, the Chaldæan year, which *begins* in them, and not that which is *conumerary* with them, it may ſeem on a ſuperficial view, that he places thoſe events in the 418th Ch. y. altho' in reality it is in the 417th; as is farther confirmed in his Catalogue of Eclipſes in 8th *lib.* where he once more places this eclipſe, "Sept. 21, in the 4383d of Julian

* Hæc defectio contigit anno ſecundo Ol. 112, Nabon. 417—anno periodi Jul. 4383, Sept. 20. —Again in his *Not. ad Fragmenta p.* 40, at words, Η προ των Ιλιαχων he ſays, Capta eſt Babylon ab Alexandro in Per. Jul. 4383: it was taken in the ſame Julian year, in which the victory at Arbela was obtained.

period,

period, and in the 3311ſt before Chriſt*:" the 418th of Nab. did not begin until the following Nov. 14.

Helvicus afterwards, poſſibly ſenſible of theſe defects in the methods taken by Scaliger and Petavius to remove the force of this proof from Agathias, has formed a different ſcheme to evade it: he pretends, "That Agathias reckoned by olympic years from the 1ſt of 55 ol. to the 2d of 112 ol. but *excluſively* of thoſe firſt and laſt two years *from* which and *to* which he computed, whereby the ſum would be reduced to 228†." But hereby he excludes 1 year and ½ after Cyrus's ſuppoſed time of acceſſion by Diodorus and alſo another half year before Darius's defeat, by beginning and ending at Midſummer, therefore 2 years upon the whole: now what is this but to accuſe Agathias of an error, by ſuppoſing him to uſe ſuch a method as neceſſarily reckons up 1 year leſs than Petavius, and 2 years leſs than Diodorus? This is begging the very queſtion in debate,

* "Annus hic eſt per. Jul. 4383 ante Chriſt. 331, Olymp. 112. ann. 2do." 13 *Calculus ecliptici Plenilunii*, &c. Again *lib.* 10. 36. P. I. 4383 ann. hic. Nab. 417.

† Regnum Perſicum a Cyro ad Darium duravit annos ſolidos 228, Agathia Authore, *excluſis* initio et fine ab ol. 55. ann. 1, ad ol. 112 ann. 2, cum utroque annos 230. *Theatr. Hiſtor. Oxf. p.* 60.

and

and only evading a proof of one's own error by ſuppoſing a poſſible method how he might have fallen into an error himſelf: yet tho' it is poſſible, it is not probable, becauſe 500 years after Chriſt it was quite out of faſhion to concern one's ſelf with olympic years; and it is more probable, that he reckoned by the Julian years then eſtabliſhed, both as the moſt obvious as well as moſt accurate method of computing the Perſian period; which is ſuppoſed by our Chronologers to have begun in the ſpring ſoon after a Julian new year (anno Olympico 1° *exeunte*. Petav.) and it certainly ended 3 months at moſt before the end of a Julian year, and a whole year before the death of Darius; to which laſt event it ſeems more natural for Agathias to extend the ſum of Perſian reigns, than to ſhorten it, unleſs he reckoned by the Chaldæan method. But even if he did reckon by the Chaldæan table, yet no more favourable concluſion will follow concerning the commencement of Cyrus than before; for if from 416 we deduct 228, there remain indeed 188, and Cyrus by this method would have commenced with 189: but then we know, that the *nominal* acceſſion of Kings in this table can never be placed lower than the *real* truth, and for the moſt part much higher, often almoſt a whole

whole year before the *real* day of acceſſion; ſo that even by this method it does not appear, that Cyrus *really* commenced long if any thing before the 190th year*. Now it ought to be remembered, that this is all which I have any buſineſs to contend for, namely, that Chronologers have not in a *ſatisfactory* manner proved their point, that Cyrus commenced before the 190th year; but have left it as a matter of doubt at beſt, if not of probability arriving near to certainty, that he ought not to be placed higher: for if it ſhould afterwards be found, that in caſe he be placed no higher than the 190th year, many ſuperior dates of different unconnected authors will be found to agree well together, which will otherwiſe diſagree, all muſt acknowledge that ſuch a conſonancy becomes an additional proof, which removes the former doubt, and determines the point in queſtion. But in the preſent caſe, all thoſe who have taken this paſſage of Agathias into conſideration, have been able to find no ſatisfactory means to remove

* We have no knowledge of the ſeaſon of year, when Cyrus commenced; it is a mere ſuppoſition of Petavius and his followers, that he acceded in the ſpring, adopted in order to reconcile his acceſſion to their own date, and yet at the ſame to the 1ſt year of 55 ol. as in Diodorus, &c.

its teſtimony in my favour; for Scaliger has made two accidental miſtakes, which ſet aſide his concluſion; Petavius has made an apparently wilful one, and Helvicus nothing more than a bare ſuppoſition, that Agathias might poſſibly have been as inaccurate as they themſelves: and if any other perſon ſhould be inclined to make the farther ſuppoſition, that Agathias might reckon by the Chaldæan æra inſtead of the Olympic, yet ſtill no adverſe concluſion can reſult from it; for there will be not only the former preſumption, but the following proof that Cyrus could not accede until near the end of his 1ſt year by that æra, juſt as I have ſhewn to be the caſe with his ſucceſſors Cambyſes and Darius afterwards: becauſe the firſt of Cyrus's 9 years over Babylon begin, apparently at leaſt, half a year if not more before the *real* time of his *victory* over Nabonadius; which muſt neceſſarily raiſe up the beginning of his firſt 20 years over Perſia to be half a year or more before the *real* time of his *acceſſion*. Concerning theſe 20 years ſee my *third* proof from Euſebius.

I may add ſtill farther, that there is another reaſon, why we ought to think, that Agathias did not reckon the reigns of the firſt Perſian kingdom by Olympic years, becauſe he certainly reckoned the reigns of the

the ſecond Perſian kingdom during his own age by the Aſiatic æra of Seleucidæ and therefore either by Julian years, or what amounted to nearly the ſame thing by Greek years, ſuch as were uſed by ſome of thoſe who adopted the æra of Seleucidæ, which began in either the ſpring or autumn: for he computes it to be "the 538th year from the commencement of the æra of Alexander, i. e. of Seleucidæ, down to the eſtabliſhment of the 2d Perſian kingdom by Artaxerxes in the 4th year of the Roman Emperor Alexander*." Here indeed Scaliger pretends, that he has made an error of 2 years, and that it ought to be only 536†: but the error is in himſelf; for the æra of Seleucidæ began according to the computations of many other antients, as well as of Agathias, near the beginning of the 12th year of the æra of Phillip, which was therefore the 436th Ch. y. conumerary with the 312th before Chriſt. That Emperor began, as we have ſeen p. 279, not until June, in the 222d year of Chriſt, therefore his 4th year,

* Ετεσιν ὑσϛερον οκτω και τριακοντα και πεντακοσιοις Αλεξανδρου του παυ τε Μακεδονος, τεταρτω δε ετει της θατερας Αλεξανδρου της Μαμμαιας αρχης, της των Περσων βασιλειας επιλαβομενω τω Αρταξερξη. *Lib.* 4.

† Duobus annis plus dixit; anni ſunt 536 *Em. Temp. lib.* 5.

reckoned from his *real* acceſſion, would not end until June in 226: now 312 added to 226 amount to 538, which Julian year or year of the Greek æra, would therefore be *cotemporary* with the latter half of the 4th year of Alexander. Hence then ariſes a ſtronger reaſon to believe, that Agathias reckoned upward alſo to the 1ſt Perſian monarchy from the æra of Seleucidæ by the ſame Greek or Julian years, by which he computed downward to the ſecond Perſian monarchy; or at worſt by the years of the Chaldæan æra. But in reality the æra of Seleucidæ was only a continuation of the Chaldæan æra in Aſia, juſt as the æra of Phillip was a continuation of it in Egypt, only with this difference, that they commenced in different years, and one was computed by fixed years, the other by retrograde. The æra of Phillip, commenced at Alexander's death, and after the Chaldæan method from the new year's day *before* his death: But the æra of Seleucidæ began at the death of Alexander's ſon Alexander Ægus on the 12th Phillipean year after: Aſia as well as Egypt might uſe the æra of Phillip till Ægus was poiſoned by Caſſander; at whoſe death Seleucus firſt attained to ſome power in Aſia, and here the æra of Seleucidæ commenced, which obtained throughout

throughout Aſia; while Egypt having independent Kings of its own did not embrace it, but reckoned by the æra of Phillip and its own Kings. Thus the Chaldæan æra, which had formerly obtained throughout the Perſian dominions became divided into two parts; one of which, that of Phillip, was indubitably a mere continuation of the Chaldæan in the ſame form; and from various circumſtances the other, that of Seleucus, might at firſt have been reckoned in the ſame Chaldæan method, until the Greeks ſettled in Aſia had introduced every where a fixed year by intercalation; which was indeed very ſoon after; whereas in Egypt the Egyptians continued the uſe of the old retrograde year until the time of Auguſtus; hence the uſe of the æra of Phillip in Aſia, and the nature of the year employed in that of Seleucidæ at firſt are little known: yet ſome memorials are preſerved concerning both, which ſhew, that the new one was only another branch iſſuing from the old Chaldæan æra and its continuation under the name of Phillip. Aſſemani has proved, "That the *Syrian* author of the acts of St. Theodora of Amaſia in Pontus has dated her martyrdom in the 318th of Chriſt by the date 642, *i. e.* by the æra of Phillip." *Tom.* 2; for 318 deducted

from 642 leaves 324, the year before Chriſt, conumerary with the 1ſt of Phillip. Other evidences alſo prove, that the æra of Phillip had been received in Aſia as well as Egypt; which one may reaſonably attribute to its having been actually the ſucceſſor to the Chaldæan æra there, until the newer æra of Seleucus aroſe. The difference of one year alſo, which ſubſiſts in regard to the commencement of the æra of Seleucus, indicates its origin out of the æra of Phillip: for ſome made it commence in the 12th, and others in the 13th year of Phillip; which is as much as to ſay, that thoſe natives, who ſtill reckoned in the old Chaldæan way, began the æra of Seleucus from the new year *before* the death of Alexander Ægus; whereas the Greeks, being not accuſtomed to this method, began it only from *after* the time of his death or thereabout. Other variations alſo in the commencement of this æra ſerve to confirm the ſame truth; for ſome Greek cities in Aſia began it in ſpring, others in autumn, and in different months of thoſe ſeaſons, as well as different days of thoſe months: nothing can manifeſt more ſtrongly than theſe diverſities among the Greeks themſelves, that they had departed and broke away from ſome common rule of commencement for the

the year in Aſia without having agreed on a new general rule for their future conduct in place of the old one, when they ſubſtituted Macedonian months and an intercalated year inſtead of the retrograde year of the Chaldæan and Phillipean æra current in Aſia. The title again always given to the æra of Seleucus, viz. that *from Alexander the Great*, as hereby Agathias, ſuggeſts, that they had reckoned by the years of Alexander Ægus in the æra of Phillip, as long as he lived (who is the next King in that æra after Phillip himſelf) for the æra of the acceſſion of Phillip was indifferently called by his own name and alſo by that of the *death of Alexander the Great*: but where Ægus died in this æra, Seleucus began. Hence it is plain the propriety of the title to this æra has been cenſured by the moderns without reaſon; for not only Scaliger, but Prideaux and our Benedictine author accuſe the antients of a groſs error, in not knowing that Alexander the Great had been dead 12 years before the æra of Seleucus began*; but in truth the er-

* Annos Seleucidarum Alexandreos ab *initio* monarchiæ Alexandri deduci Exiſtimat Agathias. *Sc. l.* 5. —Falſi ſunt, qui annos Græcorum ab Alexandri *obitu* numerandos exiſtimant. *Petav.* 10. 43.—This æra has no relation to Alexander, although it has by ſome been ignorantly derived from him and called the æra of Alexander. *Prid. Ann.* 312.

ror

ror is in themſelves, in ſuppoſing, that Agathias and other intelligent antients meant, when they call the æra of Seleucus *that from Alexander the Great*, that it began at the *death* of Alexander; whereas they apparently meant no more than that it commenced at the *extinction* of his *race* upon the throne; that it began from the *end* of their monarchy in Aſia, not the beginning*. Accordingly the Chaldæan æra had throughout preſerved this diſtinction of the different races of Kings upon the throne: the firſt was of *Aſſyrian* extraction; the ſecond race of *Median* origin; the third of *Perſian*, the fourth the *Grecian race* of Alexander: If the riſing fortune of Seleucus gave origin to the next æra, he was very unfortunate, that no nation hitherto ſhould have preſerved the name of Seleucus to it, but either that of Alexander, or the æra of contracts, or Dilcarnain, or of Greeks. We have no knowledge (except from Diodorus, whoſe authority is not ſufficient) in which of theſe two years, the 12th or 13th of Phillip (the 312th and 311th before Chriſt) Ægus died; but according to him it was in the Roman year anſwering to the latter date; yet as every olympic year was divided between two Roman ones, he often relates in a later Roman

* Æra Alexandræa ab Alexandri *ſucceſſoribus* vocata eſt, non ab Alexandro ipſo. *Petav.* 10. 40.

year

year what belonged to the foregoing one, not merely as an error, but as a more convenient method of preventing his relation of the ſame ſubject from becoming disjointed by referring each event exactly to its right year. We are equally ignorant of the ſeaſon at which Ægus died; but even if it was not really until the 13th of Phillip, yet if he died before the 9th of November, in that Jul. year 311, the commencement of Seleucus would be reckoned by the Chaldæan method from November in the preceding 12th, the 312th before Chriſt. Neither are Chronologers even now agreed concerning what difference there was in the commencement of this æra by different authors: Petavius ſays ſome began it in the ſpring, and ſome in the autumn of the year 312; Uſher agrees to this, but adds, that others did not begin it until the ſpring in 311; Calviſius ſays, not until the autumn in 311: Prideaux differs from his predeceſſors, and places the commencement either on the autumn of 312 or in the ſpring of 311. Until theſe different facts be better ſettled, it is in vain for Prideaux to invent his reaſon for this difference of a year in computation, ſuch as that Seleucus firſt got poſſeſſion of Babylon in the autumn of 312, but being diſpoſſeſſed by Demetrius regained it in 311.

This

This is only an imaginary reaſon by modern Chronologers, and the title alſo of the *æra of Seleucidæ* a mere modern invention, totally unknown to antient nations themſelves, who acknowledge no other title than *the æra from Alexander**: and however Ægus may be conſidered now as only a nominal King, yet he was actually King of Macedon; and Eumenes with a large army ſupported his pretenſions in Aſia until 3 years before the death of Ægus; the chief reaſon alſo why Antigonus then put Eumenes to death was his attachment to the family of Alexander. It may then perhaps with more probability be conjectured, that ſuch differences in computation aroſe from a very different cauſe, and had no relation to Seleucus nor his poſſeſſion of Babylon or diſpoſſeſſion; but merely to that difference of a year at the death of Ægus, which muſt neceſſarily ariſe between the Chaldæan method of computing in that æra, and the cuſtomary method of the Greeks.

* The Syrian Chriſtians ſtill compute by it, and ſtyle it *from Aliſcandria*: Joſephus is, I think, the only antient, who has once only joined the name of Seleucus to it. *Antiq.* 12. 8. Many Aſiatics alſo call it *of Younanes*, i. e. *Jones, Greeks* (Herbelot). Can we ſuppoſe whole nations miſled by *ignorance*? The æra would plainly have acquired the ſame commencements and titles, tho' Seleucus had never exiſted; for where in the Chaldæan æra the race of Alexander ended, the *kingdoms of Greeks* began, of which that of Antigonus was then the chief, and that of Seleucus the leaſt, altho' the latter flouriſhed more afterwards.

Some farther proofs of the abovementioned truths I purpoſe to collect afterwards in a ſeparate *Diſſertation*, drawn from the following and other ſources; namely, in the firſt place, that a ſimilar difference of 1 year ſubſiſts in regard to the commencement of later æras in Aſia, wherein Seleucus had no concern, and for which no other probable cauſe can be aſſigned, than this ſame neceſſary interval of a year between the native Aſiatic or Chaldæan method of computation, and that which the Greeks and Romans had afterwards ſucceſſively introduced there: again, in the ſecond place, that the *Greek* æra of Seleucus commenced not only from the two very years of the æra of Phillip, which preceded and followed the death of Alexander Ægus (312 and 311, b. C.) but even from the very ſame ſeaſon of year (autumn) at which the Egyptian year then commenced, which was upon the 9th of November; nay ſtill farther, even from the very ſame Macedonian month *Dius*, in which that firſt Egyptian month then uſually commenced. For the lunar and moveable month *Dius* was then generally coincident with the latter half of October (theſe being both in Macedonian and Julian calendars the fourth months after the ſummer ſolſtice)

ſolſtice) but ſometimes it began a few days ſooner than the beginning of October, and on every third year not until near the end of it, ſo that it generally included the 9th of November, and the firſt half of the firſt Egyptian or Aſiatic month; which would conſequently be conſidered as correſpondent with the Macedonian month *Dius*. Now *Dius*, we certainly know alſo, was the firſt month of the year among the Aſiatic Greeks; and as we are totally ignorant with what month the Macedonian year commenced before the conqueſt of Aſia, a doubt ariſes, whether it was by mere accident, that the month *Dius*, if the firſt when brought from Europe, happened thus nearly to correſpond with the firſt Aſiatic and Egyptian month; or whether the Macedonians ſettled in Aſia did not lay aſide their old European commencement of the year, and adopt a new one current in Aſia, when they became intermixed with the natives, and found that the new year throughout all Aſia commenced at that ſeaſon which coincided generally with their own month *Dius*, tho' not the firſt before. I ſhall not take upon me to reſolve this doubt, as I know of no ſufficient proofs to proceed upon; but hence ariſes a 3d proof (*ad Hominem* at leaſt) in favor

favor of what has been advanced; for Petavius, Dodwell and others confidently affirm, that the Macedonian year in Europe, before the conqueſt of Aſia, commenced as in the Athenian cycles of Meto and Calippus at the ſummer Solſtice: conſequently if this be true, the Macedonians when ſettled in Aſia *muſt have* adopted even that ſame ſeaſon for the commencement of their year, which was uſual among the natives of Aſia, along with the Aſiatic æra of computation; but in either caſe plainly began their computation in the æra of Seleucus from the very ſame month *Dius*, at which the Aſiatic year commenced in the Chaldæan æra and æra of Phillip, as nearly as Macedonian moveable lunar months could correſpond to Egyptian ſolar ones*. My intended future diſcuſſion of theſe ſubjects will in courſe lead me into a conſideration of the nature of the Macedonian calendar, a ſubject, which has been hitherto rendered very confuſed, like many others, only by the haſty conjectures and wanton altercations of Scaliger, Petavius, Uſher, Noris, Dodwell, Corſini, and Jackſon; but which may be extricated out of all the difficulties in

* Hence, after the introduction of the fixed Julian year, this æra commenced on Oct. 1, as we learn from Alfraganus and others.

which they have involved it, ſo as to be rendered both obvious and almoſt certain, without any unwarrantable ſuppoſitions whatever.

Upon the whole then, this much at leaſt appears at preſent to be evident, that whether Agathias computed backward from the æra of Seleucus to the acceſſion of Cyrus by the ſame Greek years of that æra, as thoſe employed by him in computing downward; or whether he computed backward by the Aſiatic years uſed in the Chaldæan or Egyptian æra, they would all of them have been means of leading him to greater accuracy rather than leſs; ſince they all three nearly coincided with each other, and differed in no conſiderable degree from Julian years. But there is ſtill another reaſon, why we may both place a greater dependance on this computation by Agathias, and alſo reaſonably preſume, that it was made with accuracy by Greek or Julian years, rather than with inaccuracy by olympic ones; which is, that in fact Agathias himſelf intimates, that it was not his own, but that his authority for it was a good one, namely, that of Alexander Polyhiſtor, a native of Aſia, who had long dwelt at Rome about the time of Sylla, where he compoſed his various hiſtories of antient nations; an

hiſtorian

hiſtorian alſo of credit, who wrote 500 years before Agathias, and even before Diodorus, yet later than Eratoſthenes in Egypt, the reputed father of accurate chronology: whoſe ſyſtem has unfortunately periſhed, while that of Timæus his predeceſſor in this ſcience, if not the earlieſt author who cultivated it, has been in great meaſure preſerved by his countryman Diodorus of Sicily, who profeſſes to follow Timæus in chronology and apparently in his errors. Now Diodorus, on account of his work being a brief and univerſal, therefore a popular hiſtory, has been chiefly followed by the firſt Chriſtian chronologers: thus the errors of Timæus have been perpetuated; while the corrections of Eratoſthenes have been forgot; excepting that Dionyſius and Clemens have fortunately preſerved ſome few of his computations, and Agathias perhaps may have here from Polyhiſtor preſerved ſome others*. There are therefore ſtill

* Cum vero Medi annis non minus trecentis imperio potiti ſunt, Cyrus Cambyſæ filius, Aſtyage debellato, ad Perſas imperium tranſtulit—Quum vero etiam perſici Reges annis octo & viginti ſupra ducentos imperaſſent, horum etiam imperium *penitus* eſt collapſum [οκτω τε και εικοσι και διακοσια ετη και μεντοι και ἡ των αρχη τελεωτατα διερρυη] ab externo exercitu & rege alienigena diſſipatum: Alexander enim, interfecto Dario totâ que Perſide devicta, ad Macedonicam gubernationem res tranſtulit:—quum vero imperaſſent

ſome other parts of this paſſage, which merit obſervation. For inſtance, the word *penitus* cannot well be reconciled with any ſuch ſuppoſition, as that Agathias might make the Perſian empire end more early than Alexander's deciſive victory at Arbela; and the ſubſequent mention of Darius's death and the conqueſt of *all Perſia* ſeem rather to confirm, that he computed down to theſe lateſt events*. Again, the accuracy of his computation of the Perſian period, and alſo that he reckoned down to the very laſt remains of it, are both of them confirmed by his accurate computation of the Macedonian period, and by his again carrying down his computation in this caſe alſo to the very laſt year, that any one Macedonian kingdom ſubſiſted, which had ariſen out of the ruins of the Perſian empire.

peraſſent [Macedones] non minore ſpatio quam Medi, *ſeptem* videlicet annis minus, Romanis fracti ſunt; nam *etiam hac in re credendum eſt Polybiſtori. Lib.* 2.

* Uſher conceives, that thoſe authors, ſuch as Ælian and Strabo, who allowed 10 or 11 years to the reign of Alexander over Perſia, inſtead of 8 only, reckoned it to commence with his firſt victory at Granicus, or his ſecond at Iſſus (Darium evertens Alexander per decem vel undecem annos imperavit ipſe. *Strab. l.* 15). But theſe words of Agathias cannot be tortured into ſuch a meaning. *Vide Uſher de ann. Macedonico c.* 1. *p.* 13.

For

For authors in general conſider the Period of Macedonian Empire to have ended, when Tigranes king of Armenia expelled the poſterity of Seleucus from the kingdom of Syria in the 83d year before Chriſt, 248 years after the victory at Arbela*: but here we find, that Agathias allows 300 years to this period; he muſt therefore have carried down his computation as far as to the conqueſt of Cleopatra and Egypt by Auguſtus, which was indeed exactly 300 years after the victory at Arbela; for this was near the end of the 331ſt before Chriſt, and the conqueſt by Auguſtus in the beginning of the 30th before Chriſt. The duration then of

* Vide Prideaux at ann. 83 before Chriſt. Thus Strabo makes the Macedonian period to be *about* 250 years: but Scaliger erroneouſly underſtands Strabo as meaning the Perſian period; which I take notice of, leſt any one ſhould think that ſuch a credible author as Strabo contradicts Polyhiſtor in the Perſian p. "Errat Strabo, qui de ratione *imperii perſici* ſcribit ὅλι συνεμεινε ὁσον πεντακοντα επι τοις διακοσιοις ετη, nam viginti duobus plus dicit." *(Lib.* 5.) But Strabo's words are "Cum Alexander Darium evertiſſet, ipſe 11 annis regnavit: *Poſtea* imperium in complures ſucceſſores, & ab eis profectos diviſum everſumque eſt; permanſit tamen *circiter* 250 annis." *Lib.* 15. *ap. fin.* It is indeed true, that Sulp. Severus makes the Perſian period to be 250 years, but this error, as I ſhall ſhew, was probably derived from the computations of Joſephus.

this

that period aſcertains the meaning of Agathias concerning the Median period, namely, that he allowed to this 7 years more than 300, and not 7 leſs than 300 to *that:* here therefore is another computation, which claims attention, preſerved by Agathias from Polyhiſtor, that is, the duration of the period from the deſtruction of the firſt Aſſyrian empire by Arbaces the Mede and Beleſis the Babylonian, down to the acceſſion of Cyrus, amounting to 307 years: and this prophane authority is the more valuable, becauſe on account of the diſagreements concerning this period between Diodorus, Euſebius, and Syncellus, both Uſher and Prideaux have taken occaſion to ſet out with a grand error, that this Beleſis, who aſſiſted Arbaces, was the ſame as Nabonaſſar, under whom the Chaldæan æra commenced, and Arbaces the ſame as Tiglah Pileſer in ſcripture: whereas it is evident that Arbaces and Beleſis muſt have lived 100 years before either of the others. To this error the univerſal hiſtory, Blair, and moſt others have as readily acceded, as if a hundred years was nothing to ſtand in the way of ones own conjectures in the connexion of ſacred and prophane Hiſtory; neither do I know of any chronologer, who has

has made proper uſe of this teſtimony of Polyhiſtor, in order to decide between the diſagreements of the other antients, or who has even referred to it, except Uſher, and he is the very author whom it refutes. Laſtly, as the minuteneſs of theſe ſeveral computations ſupport and add credit to the accuracy of each other, ſo they contribute to fix more exactly the age of Polyhiſtor; for it appears hereby, that he compoſed ſome of his works later than Diodorus and the conqueſt of Egypt; yet that he was no copier from Timæus and Diodorus is evident by his diſagreement with them as to the duration of theſe principal periods of hiſtory: he might therefore probably follow the better authority and computations of Eratoſthenes; and he becomes hereby a more credible *prophane* teſtimony to oppoſe to Diodorus in regard to the acceſſion of Cyrus, and to contradict what Africanus aſſerts, that all other antients agreed with Diodorus in this date.

Euſebius ſhews us, that there were alſo *chriſtian* authorities, extant in his time, which agreed with the foregoing one from Polyhiſtor; for altho' indeed in the dates of his Chronicon he himſelf follows Diodorus, yet in one place he incidentally informs

us of a computation by others, which agrees with Curtius and Polyhiſtor and adds a *third* proof of the date in queſtion. The Chaldæan æra (by its containing only a liſt of the kings of Babylon) begins the reign of Cyrus only from his conqueſt of Babylon, and thus leaves us at loſs how long he might have reigned over Perſia before: but Euſebius fortunately by accident ſupplies this Deficiency; for under the 20th year of Cyrus he ſubjoins this remark, "Colligitur omne tempus captivitatis Judæorum annis 70; qui *ſecundum quoſdam* a tertio anno Joachim uſque ad *viceſimum* annum Cyri Regis Perſarum computantur*." This is the only paſſage, I believe, extant, which informs us, that any of the antient Chriſtians had any juſt conception at what event the 70 years propheſied of by Jeremiah and the captivity of the Jews really ended, namely, not at the acceſſion of Cyrus to Perſia, but in his 20th year of reign. This anecdote moreover ſhews it to have been the current computation of the times, that the conqueſt

* Apud Olymp. 59. Scaliger in his *pretended* Greek of Euſebius has the 19th year only; but he does not pretend to have found any other reading than *viceſimum* in any manuſcripts of the Latin Euſebius: nor yet Pontacus in his edition.

of

of Babylonia was effected in his 20th year, and Euſebius no where elſe has the leaſt reference to the conqueſt of this country; ſo that this paſſage again contains the only notice of the date of this event extant, except that in the Chaldæan æra. Now if, in order to raiſe Cyrus as high as this date can poſſibly admit, we ſuppoſe Euſebius to mean, that the 20th of Cyrus was fully expired; yet on adding 20 years of reign over Perſia at the head of his 9 over Babylonia which begin with the 210th year, the firſt of the 20 will again commence no higher than the 190th year juſt as in the two foregoing caſes. But the modern ſyſtems hitherto have never been able to conform to this date of theſe antients, in placing the conqueſt of Babylonia at the end of the 20th year, but of the 21ſt or 22d or 23d, becauſe they had placed Cyrus's acceſſion 1 or 2 or 3 years too ſoon. The exact ſums then of theſe firſt Perſian reigns were as follow: Cyrus 20 complete years before his conqueſt of Babylonia and 9 after. Cambyſes 8, including in his firſt year 7 overplus months of Cyrus. Darius 36, including in his firſt year the 7 months of Smerdis. Xerxes 5 years to the beginning of the Roman year, in which the 75th Olympiad

commenced, in all 78 years. But between the 55th Ol. and 75th Ol. are contained 80 years, which Diodorus and his follower Euſebius diſtribute in this manner, 30 to Cyrus, 8 to Cambyſes, 1 to Smerdis, 36 to Darius, and 5 to Xerxes, in all 80; which two ſupernumerary years are filled up by allowing 1 to Smerdis, and 1 too much to Cyrus: the moderns indeed have reduced that 1 year allowed to Smerdis, but it has been through a falſe ſenſe attributed to Herodotus; whereas we have found, by the right method of the Chaldæan æra, and other proofs, that not only this year but alſo the 30th of Cyrus ought both to be reduced, they having only ariſen from double reckonings by *ſome* antients of overplus months in thoſe and the contiguous reigns. There can be no good reaſon therefore why the moderns ſhould not make this reduction of 2 years by rightly underſtanding the method of the Chaldæan æra, half of which they had before conſented to make, by not rightly tranſlating Herodotus: neither can there be any good reaſon to ſuppoſe, that Timæus, Diodorus and others could not have fallen into ſuch an error, by not underſtanding the method of the Chaldæan æra, whence they probably copied

their

their ſums of reign; when it is evident, that the moſt learned moderns have hitherto fallen into a ſimilar error through the ſame means.

Here then we have gained a *third* ſecure ſtep in our computations upwards, by aſcertaining the right date of the commencement of the Perſian empire; which I might ſtill farther confirm, both by various other collateral proofs, and alſo by pointing out objections to which the teſtimony of Diodorus to the contrary is liable; but as theſe would branch out into many enquiries, particularly into an enquiry concerning Joſephus's dates of this Event (for he has more than one) they muſt be included in a ſeparate *Diſſertation:* at preſent therefore I ſhall only add, that the counter teſtimony of Diodorus cannot be reaſonably conſidered as of any importance, becauſe by proving too much, it proves nothing; for it equally proves againſt the modern ſyſtems with reſpect to their reduction of *one* year, in caſe it has any force againſt the foregoing evidence for our reduction of *two* years; and if any one ſhould allow the one correction, but not the other, what is this but to blow hot and cold with the ſame breath, and prove right and wrong by the very ſame evidence?

evidence? more eſpecially ſince Diodorus is an author of ſo little credit in Chronology, that even Petavius the founder of our modern ſyſtems in this article, repeatedly objects to his evidence, nor ever prefers it to that of other antients in any caſe whatever, nor even ſtrictly adheres to it in this very one. We will therefore next proceed to fix the commencement of the kingdom of Media, and to ſhow, that in reality Herodotus, Cteſias, and Euſebius do all in this point agree together, notwithſtanding that the moderns have pretended to find them at variance; and that this antient error in placing Cyrus over Perſia 2 years too early, has been one cauſe of creating any apparent but not real diſagreements in thoſe authors concerning Media, our next article of enquiry.

A TABLE

A TABLE
OF THE
True Dates of Events for the foregoing Sections, together with erroneous Dates by others.

Olympiads.	Years before Christ	Chal. Dates	Years of Reign		Jewish Reigns
$35\frac{2}{3}$	638	110		*The 51st year in Josephus, 8th in Eusebius after 1st of Josiah; 4th in Petavius, Usher, and Univ. Hist. the 3d in Prideaux, Jackson and Blair, the 2d in Vignoles.* Readers will hereby see some of the effects of our corrections in later ages.	1 of Josiah *r.* 31
		115		*The 13th of Josiah according to the erroneous system of Eusebius; which is hereby the 74th year before the accession of Cyrus in 190th Ch. year both exclusive, but 72 only before Cyrus, if he acceded in 1st of 55 Ol.* as in Eusebius.	
		122		The real 13th of Josiah, and 69th before Cyrus and 190th year both inclusively.	13
	625	123	1	Of Nabopolasar father to Nebuchadnezzar.	
		141	19	- - - - - - - - - - -	1 of Jehoi. *r.* 11
	605	143	21	Nebuchadnezzar, being general of his father's army, invaded Judæa in the 3d of Jehoiakim according to Daniel, and a little before his father's death according to Berosus in Josephus.	3
		144	1	Of Nebuchadnezzar; who in this year defeated Nechao king of Egypt at Carchemish (Jer. xlvi. 2.) but in which of these two years Jerusalem was taken may be a doubt; if not until November in this year, Nebuchadnezzar's father was probably dead before this, and therefore he might be properly styled king by Daniel at the capture of the city, tho' not at his first entry into Judæa; from which *first* invasion of Palestine Jeremiah's prophecy, *that those nations should serve the king of Babylon 70 years* is to be dated.	4
		151	8	Nebuchadnezzar takes Jerusalem again and carries Jehoiakim's son prisoner to Babylon; (2 K. xxiv. 12.) this year Ezechiel dates as the 1st of the captivity of the Jews, for the year in which the temple was burnt he calls the 12th. If Ezechiel then reckoned inclusively, why should not the 70 years be reckoned so likewise.	11
		152	9	Nebuchadnezzar makes Zedekiah king, when the foregoing year expired (2 Chr. xxxvi. 10.)	1 of Zedekiah *r.* 11
$47\frac{1}{2}$	591	157		*The 11th of Zedekiah and temple burnt according to Eusebius; the 71st year before the 2d of Darius the 1st.*	
$48\frac{2}{3}$	586	162	19	The 11th of Zedekiah and burning of Temple could not be *sooner* than this year the 19th of Nebuchadnezzar (2 K. xxv. 8.) and in the 5th month. This is the 12th year of the captivity in Ezechiel (xxxii. 1.) on the 12th month of which, viz. about February in the following Julian year, he prophesied of the eclipse in the next May. Neither could the capture of the city be	11

Olympiads.	Years before Christ	Chal. Dates.	Years of Reign		Jewish Reigns.
				be *later* than this y. as appears from xxxiv. 21, where in 10th month of 12th year he says, that he first heard the city was taken.	
$\frac{3}{4}$	585	163	20	Total eclipse of the Sun on May 28. See it foretold in Ezechiel 3 months before (xxxii. 7.) the same as that predicted by Thales to the Jonians.	13 y. in Ezech.
$55\frac{4}{1}$	560	188		*The accession of Cyrus to Persia and Media according to Diodorus, and after him by Africanus, Eusebius and all old christian chronologers, together with Scaliger.*	
$\frac{1}{2}$	559	189		*The accession of Cyrus to Persia and Media according to Petavius, and after him by Usher, Prideaux, Blair and all moderns, in the latter half of 1st of 55th Ol. in spring.*	
$\frac{2}{3}$	558	190		The real accession of Cyrus could not be sooner than this year, and probably not before midsummer, because according to Eusebius and Syncellus his 29th year was not expired when he gained his victory over Nabonadius in 210th Ch. year.	
	538	210	1	Of Cyrus over Babylonia beginning on January 5 before his decisive victory.	
$56\frac{4}{1}$	537	211	2	Babylon could not be taken before August in this year, but might have been later.	
	536	212	3	The *first* year of Cyrus, after the capture of Babylon, from which Ezra and the Jews reckoned. The Jews were returned before the 7th month (Ezra iii. 1.) Ezra was only 4 months in performing the same Journey; (vii. 8.) therefore the edict not published probably until about the beginning of this year.	
		218	9	And last of Cyrus over Babylon; but who was not slain until Midsummer in the following year, having reigned 29 years and 7 months.	
		219	1	Of Cambyses, who acceded about Midsummer.	
$63\frac{4}{1}$		220			
		226	8	Of Cambyses, who died about the winter solstice and end of this Chaldæan year on Jan. 1. *reigned* 5 months and 7 years.	
	521	227	1	Of Darius; Smerdis reigned during the first 7 months of this year beginning about Jan. 1; an interregnum filled up a part of the remainder of the year; so that Darius did not really accede until near the following winter solstice.	
$65\frac{4}{1}$	520	228	2	Of Darius, as it must necessarily be reckoned by the Chaldæan table on account of the foregoing circumstances; but the 1st of his reign by the Parian marbles, and Greek method of reckoning; the years of which began then at winter solstice. This year was the 256th before last date of Parian marbles; and the battle of Leuctra is marked there as the 107th, which all agree to have been in the Julian year conumerary with 2d of 102d Ol. interval therefore inclusively 150 years; which fixes the first of Darius on the Chaldæan year conumerary with 1st of 65th Ol.	

Olympiads.	Years before Christ	Chal. Dates	Years of Reign		Æra of Phillip
				Ol. This is only the 67th year after that in which the temple was burnt, both inclusively, not the 70th as in Eusebius.	
75 4/4	480	268	6	Of Xerxes, who passed the Hellespont in spring and entered Greece about Midsummer.	
102 1/4		377		The 107th year before last date of Parian marbles. In this year Epaminondas with the Thebans defeated the Lacedemonians at Leuctra, soon after Midsummer.	
112 1/2	331	417	1	Of Alexander. In winter and spring Alexander went into Egypt where he probably founded Alexandria; returned and marched into Assyria, and on October 1 gained the victory at Arbela; entered Babylon soon after, remained there 30 days. This Chaldæan year 417 ended in November and was the 228th from accession of Cyrus in 190th year both inclusively.	
2/3	330	418	2	Marches against Susa and Persepolis, thence proceeds against the Mardi in the mountains in the middle of Persia after 7th of May, which were then covered with snow: follows Darius, who was slain about Midsummer: the 229th from Cyrus.	
3/4	329	419	3	Narbarsanes writes to Alexander about terms of accommodation; is refused. The Greek mercenaries and remainder of Darius's royal family surrender with the Persian nobles, which completed the Persian conquest: the 230th from Cyrus.	
114 4/4	324	424	8	And last year of Alexander, ending November 12, where the Chaldæan æra ends; but Alexander did not die until June in the following year 323.	
114 1/4	323	425	1	Of the NEW ÆRA of Phillip Aridæus, brother to Alexander, commencing on November 12 in the preceeding Julian year before Alexander's death.	1
		431	7	And last of Phillip.	7
		432	1	Of Alexander Ægus, son to Alexander the Great by Roxana.	
117 4/4	312	436	5	Of Ægus; the 12th year of æra of Phillip ended on 9th of November; *about* which season commenced the 1st of the NEW ÆRA of Seleucidæ; but Ægus was not slain until the following year.	12
1/4	311	437	6	Ægus slain in this year, the 13th of Phillip, according to Diodorus, the only evidence to the date extant. Some Greek cities, the later Syrians and Arabians perhaps might begin the æra of Seleucus from the autumn or spring of this year, *i. e.* from the new year next after the death of Ægus; but that the Chaldæans did the same, as Prideaux asserts (at year 312) is said without proof; the three dates by this æra in Ptolomy, ascribed there to the Chaldæans, being	13

Olympiads.	Years after Christ	Chal. Dates.	Years of Reign		Æra of Phillip
				ing by Macedonian lunar months only, not Chaldæan or Egyptian solar ones, proves them to be computations of the Greeks in Chaldæa, not native Asiatic ones.	
201¾	28	775	16	Of Tiberius, the 548th year from 2d of Darius both inclusively, this was only the 15th by the Greek and Roman method of computing from the Day of accession on Aug. 19.	
	68	815	22	And last of Nero, who died on June 9 in this year 68: and the 391st of Phillip ended on 6th of August following.	391
				Galba, Otho and Vitellius reigned from June 9 in 68 to July 1st in 69.	
	69	816	1	Of Vespasian, who acceded on July 1; but the 392d of Phillip commenced on August 6th in 68.	392
	217	964		The last year of Caracalla, who died in April, and the 540th of Ph. ended on June 30th after in 217th of Christ. Macrinus reigned from the above April to June 3 in 218.	540
	218	965	1	Of Elagabalus, who acceded not until June 3 in this year, but his first Egyptian year 541 commenced on June 30 in the preceeding year 217.	541
	222	969	1	Of Emperor Alexander Mammaiæ, who acceded not until June in this Julian year 222, a little before the end of 545th Egyptian year on June 29: but this his first Egyptian year commenced on June 29 in 221.	545
	226		5	4th Roman year of Alexander ends with June in this year, the 538th Julian year from beginning of æra of Seleucidæ on 312th before Christ both inclusively.	

CMC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

CORREC-

CORRECTIONS

IN THE

FIRST VOLUME.

See also p. 199.

P. 110. lin. 27. For cenſures paſt, &c. *read* cenſures paſſed by chronologers upon the beſt prophane hiſtorians and antient memorials together with, &c.

P. 126. lin. penult. Subjoin a reference to *Hiſt. of Aſtron.* p. 236; alſo to a tract of Mr. Coſtard, intitled, *Uſe of Aſtronomy in Hiſtory*, 1764.

P. 128. *Add to note.* Being not able to find the words referred to in *Hiſt. of Aſtron.* I am in doubt whether they were not extracted from a tract of Dr. Kennedy, called, *Diſcuſſions of Chronol.* addreſſed to Dr. Blair at p. 18; where the like words occur.

P. 136. lin. ult. Expunge the whole ſentence beginning with "*yet the Jewiſh Hiſtorian*" as far as *information:* it is a miſtake ariſing from the inexplicite contents of lib. 11. c. 1. in Joſephus; but from his dates elſewhere it is evident, that he fell into the ſame error as Africanus and other antient Chriſtians, and was rather the guide, whom they followed. Read therefore, "In this they were confirmed by the Jewiſh Hiſtorian Joſephus, who wrote 150 years before Africanus; yet it is contradicted by thoſe very Jewiſh ſcriptures, which he profeſſed to follow, for, &c."

P. 164. l. 9. For πς, *read* πϛ or rather σπϛ, for thus Averanus corrects it in his *Diſſert. de Menſ. Ægypt. p.* 9. *Flor.* 1713.

P. 175. l. 5. *After* name, *add a reference* to Jackſon. vol. 2. p. 81.

P. 175. in note. *After* Hyſtaſpis *add* (p. 127.)

P. 186. l. 19. *After* built, *add* by Daniel in the reign of, &c.

P. 255. in note. *For* Banier, *read* Freret. vol. 4.

P. 261. l. 9. *For* by the antients *read* by ſome of the antients.

P. 279. l. 12. *For* July, *read* June: for Vignoli in his ſecond Diſſert. corrects himſelf in theſe words, Elagabalum vero ante, non vero poſt Cal. Jul. annis 222, uti putaveram, obtruncatum fuiſſe, p. 114.

P. 295. Expunge the 2d note, for no mention is made there of this ſubject by M. Freret; but Abbé Millot in his General Hiſt. attributes ſuch a remark to Freret in ſome of his tracts.

P. 300. *Add to firſt note,* Maundrel found mount Libanus in Paleſtine covered with froſt and ſnow on May 7th. *Journey from Aleppo, p.* 140. Haſſelquiſt ſays, that he botanized on mount Sypilus, one of the higheſt in Aſia Minor, which is covered with ſnow all the year. *p.* 411.

P. 315. l. 23. *For* 12 archons, *read* 9 archons: *and after* office *add,* who were formed into 12 companies called Prytaneiæ, each of which officiated during one lunar month.

P. 319. l. 12. in note; *after* added, *ſubjoin,* an explanation of Cenſorinus's reaſon, &c.

P. 320. in note l. penult. *for* pref. *read* chap. 1.

P. 332. l. 2. *For* conumerary with the firſt of Phillip, *read* preceding the firſt of Phillip.

P. 334. l. 9. *after* beginning, *add,* or middle.

P. 346. *To note add,* "This number 19 was copied by Scaliger, along with the reſt of the Greek for the Latin paſſage quoted above, from *Paſchal Chronicon* at *olymp.* 56. But Syncellus alſo quotes the very ſame Greek words of Euſebius, yet has 20. *p.* 227.

End of the Firſt Volume.